By Mr. MILES:

H. R. 8515. A bill to amend the act of July 18, 1940, to provide an additional 1-year period in which certain members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army may make claims for benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 8516. A bill authorizing loans from the United States Treasury for the expansion of the District of Columbia water system, and authorizing the United States to pay for water and water services secured from the water system; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CARROLL:

H. J. Res. 469. Joint resolution to appropriate funds to combat serious infestations of bark and pine beetles; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LATHAM:

H. J. Res. 470. Joint resolution directing the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Air Coordinating Committee of the Department of Commerce to carefully investigate the so-called Rome Convention limiting payment arising out of ground accidents caused by overseas air commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. J. Res. 471. Joint resolution to provide for the distribution by the Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus agricultural commodities among certain flood victims; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. Con. Res. 203. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H. Con. Res. 204. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. Con. Res. 205. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEDRICK:

H. Con. Res. 206. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. Res. 602. Resolution requesting the President to suspend his order closing the Birmingham Veterans' Hospital, at Van Nuys, Calif.; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. Res. 603. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, concerning the importation of rubber and other products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, requesting the abolition of the present partition of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 8517. A bill for the relief of Dr. Stanislaus Garstka and Dr. Marthewan Garstka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 8518. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL:

H. R. 8519. A bill for the relief of the estate of Archer C. Gunter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 8520. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Toshi Ishibashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEMKE:

H. R. 8521. A bill authorizing the issuance of patents in fee to Frank David Blackhoop and Thomas Blackhoop; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 8522. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Abraham Rough Surface and Samuel Rough Surface; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 8523. A bill for the relief of Marianna Gantschnigg and Merle Richard Gantschnigg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUINN:

H. R. 8524. A bill for the relief of Victor Francis Oberschall; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TACKETT:

H. R. 8525. A bill for the relief of Lonnie Odell Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE:

H. R. 8526. A bill for the relief of A. D. Woods; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2126. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of the Women's Club of Little Falls, N. J., opposing compulsory health insurance and favoring the voluntary approach and the preservation of free enterprise; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2127. By Mr. HAGEN: Resolution adopted by the West Central Minnesota Association of Life Underwriters and attested by Richard E. Melby, secretary, Fergus Falls, Minn., in opposition to the enactment of any legislation for the establishment of any system of compulsory health insurance and socialized medicine; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2128. By Mr. KEARNEY: Resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Fulton County, N. Y., unequivocably opposing proposed action of the State Department in encouraging imports of leather gloves from Europe by reducing present tariff rates thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2129. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution by the Racine Taxpayers, Inc., Racine, Wis., that the Congress speedily enact into law Senate bills 2212 and 2213 and House bill 5775, relating to the obsolete methods of handling postal finance and the political appointment of postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2130. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Roger Bliss, city clerk, Oshkosh, Wis., requesting and urging passage of Senate bill 2166; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2131. Also, petition of Fred Schwarzkopf, city clerk, Bridgeport, Conn., requesting that the Common Council of the City of Bridgeport, Conn., be placed on record as favoring the completion of the investigation now going on in the State Department concerning subversive activities, and also requesting that support be given to the Mundt-Nixon bill; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

2132. Also, petition of Miss Agnes C. Tuttle and others, Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., Bronx, N. Y., requesting that action be taken against the antitrust suit against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2133. Also, petition of Edwin C. M. Dickey, Washington, D. C., relative to case 197-MCS, from the United States Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2134. Also, petition of Miles D. Kennedy, director, the American Legion National Legislative Commission, Washington, D. C., relative to House bill 6277, and requesting that they be placed on record as being opposed to any legislation granting to former members of the merchant marine any veterans' benefits or any benefits akin to those normally granted veterans for their rehabilitation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1950

(Legislative day of Wednesday, March 29, 1950)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, may the hush of Thy presence move us in this hallowed moment to adoration; and may all other voices be stilled that Thine may be heard. We wait for Thy benediction that we may face whatever the day brings in the certainty of Thy guidance, in the glory of Thy service and in the solemn realization that we are indeed our brother's keeper.

Speak to us now, through the silence, and, ere duty lead us back to a noisy, crowded way, vouchsafe to our waiting hearts assurance of forgiveness, of cleansing, of empowering, that as servants of Thine and of the people we may the more worthily serve this great day, when the hearts of men are stirring with the throb of deep desire for more abundant life. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 15, 1950, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2811) to amend section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code, with respect to the importation or transportation of obscene matters, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills,

in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 5920. An act to provide for payment of amounts due mentally incompetent personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service;

H. R. 7058. An act to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7155. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7339. An act to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7739. An act to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2350. An act to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees;

S. 3396. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky.;

H. R. 1151. An act to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers;

H. R. 1354. An act to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California;

H. R. 2387. An act authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections;

H. R. 2783. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land, with improvements, to the city of Alpena, Mich.;

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer a building in Juneau, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau (Alaska) Camp;

H. R. 5097. An act for the administration of Indian livestock loans, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MYERS, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. NEELY, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

NOMINATION OF HAROLD K. HILL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I announce that a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has been called for Thursday this week, at 10 o'clock, in room 324, Senate Office Building. At that meeting it is proposed to consider the nomination of Harold K. Hill, of Wisconsin, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Mr. Hill has been invited to be present.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MYERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hill	Maybank
Benton	Hoey	Mundt
Brewster	Holland	Myers
Bricker	Humphrey	Neely
Bridges	Hunt	O'Conor
Butler	Ives	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Jenner	Robertson
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chapman	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kerr	Sparkman
Darby	Kilgore	Stennis
Donnell	Knowland	Taft
Douglas	Langer	Taylor
Dworshak	Leahy	Thomas, Okla.
Eastland	Lehman	Thomas, Utah
Ecton	Lodge	Thye
Ellender	Long	Tobey
Ferguson	Lucas	Tydings
Fulbright	McCarran	Watkins
George	McCarthy	Wherry
Gillette	McClellan	Wiley
Green	McFarland	Williams
Gurney	McKellar	Withers
Hayden	McMahon	Young
Hendrickson	Malone	

Mr. MYERS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is absent on public business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RESOLUTIONS OF COMMON COUNCIL OF MILWAUKEE, WIS.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee has been very commendably active in working out problems with Federal implications affecting Milwaukee and other major American municipalities. I have received from V. H. Hurless, city comptroller of Milwaukee, two such resolutions on critical problems facing Milwaukee and other metropolitan centers. One of the resolutions pertains to the tremendous amount of Federal property located in these big cities—property which does not pay local taxes and which thus puts a strain on municipal budgets by taking out of the field of taxable revenue considerable space.

The other resolution pertains to a matter to which I have been particularly close, and that is the question of formation of a National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. It was my pleasure to be one of the original cosponsors of this legislation, because I feel that it is only by setting up a little Hoover Commission, so to speak, which would work out the interrelationships between Federal, State, and local governments, which would consider the question of overlapping taxes, which would consider the problem of centralization of power in Washington, D. C.—only by setting up such a commission can we effectively cut through the present maze and confusion.

I believe that both of the resolutions will be of interest to my colleagues, so I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD and referred as follows:

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Whereas there is within the city of Milwaukee $15,733,200 worth of property which is owned by the United States Government; and

"Whereas no general property taxes or payments in lieu of taxes are paid on $13,970,700 worth of this Federal property; and

"Whereas enactment of the Horan bill (H. R. 7478), which is being considered by the Eightieth Congress, would result in the United States Government making payments in lieu of taxes on approximately $8,000,000 worth of this property that is located in the city of Milwaukee; and

"Whereas the Horan bill further provides for the establishment of a commission to determine the amounts to be paid in lieu of taxes; and

"Whereas the city of Milwaukee badly needs additional revenues to finance municipal services, many of which are provided to Federally owned properties: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is urged to enact legislation to provide for payments in lieu of taxes on Federally owned properties; and be it further

"Resolved, That the comptroller be and hereby is authorized and directed to urge those Representatives and Senators who represent the city of Milwaukee and Representative ANDREW L. SOMERS, chairman of the House Public Lands Committee, to act on the Horan bill (H. R. 7478) and to expedite the Budget Bureau's investigations of payment in lieu of tax problems."

To the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

"Whereas many intergovernmental problems on revenue sources, functions, immunities, ownerships, regulatory powers, etc., exist and have existed for decades; and

"Whereas no governmental agency is currently empowered to make comprehensive studies and to resolve the many questions arising between the Federal, State, and local governments; and

"Whereas bill S. 3147, which is being considered by the Eightieth Congress, would create a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (consisting of seven members appointed by the President), which would make recommendations to the Congress based on (1) a study of the relations and allocation of functions and powers between the Federal, State, and local governments; (2) a study of the fiscal relations between Federal, State, and local governments with special emphasis on tax immunities, revenue sources, and grants-in-aid: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Milwaukee, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is requested to create a temporary National Commission on Intergovernmental Relations by enacting bill S. 3147; and be it further

"Resolved, That the comptroller be and hereby is authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to Senators WILEY and MCCARTHY."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

S. 1862. A bill to provide refunds of certain deposits made for the purpose of obtaining credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, for service in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1559); and

S. 2640. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1560).

By Mr. HUNT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 7341. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to construct a bridge over the Anacostia River in the vicinity of East Capitol Street, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1565).

By Mr. MCCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. Res. 253. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1950; favorably, together with minority views (Rept. No. 1567);

S. Res. 259. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1950; without recommendation, together with individual views of Mr. BENTON (Rept. No. 1561); and

S. Res. 263. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1950; favorably, together with minority views (Rept. No. 1566).

By Mr. O'CONOR, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

S. Res. 254. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1950; adversely (Rept. No. 1562);

S. Res. 255. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 9 of 1950; adversely (Rept. No. 1563); and

S. Res. 256. Resolution disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 11 of 1950; adversely (Rept. No. 1564).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 16, 1950, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 2350. An act to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees; and

S. 3396. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CORDON:

S. 3594. A bill for the relief of Tulana Farms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S. 3595. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of San Luis Obispo Creek in California for the purpose of determining action necessary to control floods in the drainage area of such creek; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 3596. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Michael Hanak; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 3597. A bill to amend section 41 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act so as to provide a system of safety rules, regulations, and orders, and safety inspection and training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3598. A bill for the relief of William Zumsteg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY introduced Senate bill 3599, to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG:

S. 3600. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Sonobe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 3601. A bill for the relief of Victor G. Lutfalla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARRAN:

S. 3602. A bill for the relief of Antonio Artolozaga Euscola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DARBY:

S. J. Res. 181. Joint resolution giving the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of Kansas and the State of Missouri establishing a boundary between said States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCORPORATION OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF PURPLE HEART

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, at the request of numerous representatives of those men and women who have been awarded the Military Order of the Purple Heart by the Government of the United States for distinguished and meritorious service and for wounds received in combat against an enemy of the United States, while serving in the armed forces of the United States, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart.

The bill (S. 3599) to incorporate the Military Order of the Purple Heart, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 5920. An act to provide for payment of amounts due mentally incompetent personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

H. R. 7058. An act to amend laws relating to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 7155. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the States to enable them to provide technical services to private forest landowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 7339. An act to abolish the Holy Cross National Monument, in the State of Colorado, and to provide for the administration of the lands contained therein as a part of the national forest within which such national monument is situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 7739. An act to provide that service of cadets and midshipmen at the service academies during specified periods shall be considered active military or naval wartime service for the purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edwin F. Stanton, of California, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Thailand, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States on the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947;

Harold W. Dodds, of New Jersey, and Edwin B. Fred, of Wisconsin, to be members of the Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange;

Howland H. Sargeant, of Rhode Island; George D. Stoddard, of Illinois; Miss Bernice Baxter, of California; Isidor I. Rabi, of New York; and George F. Zook, of Virginia, to be representatives of the United States to the fifth session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization;

Stanley Woodward, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Canada, vice Laurence A. Steinhardt, deceased;

John G. Erhardt, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Austria, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Union of South Africa;

James E. Brown, Jr., of Pennsylvania, and sundry other Foreign Service officers, for promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service;

Thomas H. Lockett, of Kentucky, and sundry other Foreign Service officers, for promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service;

Norman Armour, Jr., of New Jersey, and sundry other Foreign Service officers, for

promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service; and

Walworth Barbour, of Massachusetts, and sundry other Foreign Service officers, for promotion in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

THE PRESIDENT'S WESTERN TOUR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPEHART

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him from Chicago on May 13, 1950, dealing with the President's western tour, which appears in the Appendix.]

SELLING AMERICAN FARMERS DOWN THE RIVER—ARTICLE BY SENATOR JENNER

[Mr. CAPEHART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Selling American Farmers Down the River," written by Senator JENNER, of Indiana, and published in the May 1950 issue of the National Republic of Washington, D. C., which appears in the Appendix.]

HOME OF CREDIT UNION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article dealing with the dedication of the International Home and headquarters of the Credit Union National Association, published in the Bulletin of the Madison and Wisconsin Foundation on May 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL-SERVICE SURVIVORSHIP BENEFITS—ARTICLE FROM THE POSTAL RECORD

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "S. 878 Should Be Enacted Into Law," published in the Postal Record of May 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT BY JOHN J. O'CONNOR, CONCERNING REORGANIZATION PLAN 21 RELATING TO UNITED STATES MARITIME COMMISSION

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement of John J. O'Connor, representing Isbrandtsen Co., Inc., before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on May 9, 1950, concerning Reorganization Plan No. 21 relating to the United States Maritime Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

AFL UNION INDUSTRIES SHOW—ARTICLE BY SYLVIA PORTER

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Big Fair Here Is Tribute to United States System," written by Sylvia Porter and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of April 20, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRANSFER OF WATSON LABORATORIES—ARTICLE FROM THE ROME DAILY SENTINEL

[Mr. IVES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Foster Urges Lab Transfer in Nationwide Broadcast," published in the Rome Daily Sentinel on April 29, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVESTIGATION OF INTERSTATE CRIME—EDITORIAL COMMENT

[Mr. KEM asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Kansas City Stares at the Kefauver Committee," published in the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal on May 14, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

EFFECT OF STRIKES ON THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wave of Crippling Strikes Hurting Democratic Party," by David Lawrence, published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat on May 12, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RAILWAY STRIKE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. DONNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Railway Strike," from the New York Times of May 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BACKGROUND ON FEPC—LETTER FROM WALTER WHITE

[Mr. BENTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Walter White entitled "Background on FEPC," published in the New York Times May 16, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIG GAS COMPANIES REAL SCUTTLERS OF KERR BILL—EDITORIAL FROM CERVI'S ROCKY MOUNTAIN JOURNAL

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Big Gas Companies Real Scuttlers of Kerr Bill," published in the April 27 issue of Cervi's Rocky Mountain Journal of Denver, Colo., on April 27, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE "ECONOMY BRANDS" MAKE THEIR CASE—EDITORIAL FROM THE RICHMOND NEWS-LEADER

[Mr. ROBERTSON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "The 'Economy Brands' Make Their Case," published in the Richmond News-Leader of May 10, 1950, which appears in the Appendix.]

CALIFORNIA LAND LAW HELD INVALIDATED BY UNITED NATIONS CHARTER—ARTICLE FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on April 28, 1950, as appears at pages 5993 and following of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I introduced into the RECORD, and made certain remarks with respect to, the decision of the District Court of Appeals of the State of California, Second Appellate District, Division 2, in a case holding that the Charter of the United Nations invalidated the California Alien Land Act.

In the New York Times of May 14, 1950, is an article with respect to an appendix by Prof. Manley O. Hudson to a petition for rehearing filed by Attorney General Howser in that case.

In view of the fact that both the decision in the case and my comments with relation to that decision are set forth in the body of the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that said article be set forth in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES' LAWS HELD ABOVE UN TENETS—EXPERT CHALLENGES CALIFORNIA COURT RULING ON OWNERSHIP OF LAND BY JAPANESE ALIENS

LOS ANGELES, May 13.—A fresh delineation of the United Nations' legal influence on internal affairs of the United States came forth this week in a California lawsuit widely watched by both the legal profession and students of international affairs.

The view was authoritatively set forth that, as admirable as the United Nations Charter and related instruments might be, their tenets might not be binding on Americans until they had been specifically embodied in local law.

On April 24 the California Court of Appeals ruled that the United Nations Charter was, as a treaty duly ratified by the United States Senate in 1945, the supreme law of the land, superseding State laws that conflicted with its provisions.

ANALYSIS BY HARVARD EXPERT

This was interpreted by the court in the case of Fujii against California as invalidating California's long-standing law which precludes land ownership by Japanese aliens, since the law contradicted United Nations Charter stipulations against racial discrimination.

A petition challenging this view and asking a rehearing, filed this week by the State Attorney General Fred N. Howser, defendant in the action, was based primarily on an analysis obtained from Dr. Manley O. Hudson, Bemis professor of international law at the Harvard Law School and chairman of the International Law Commission of the United Nations.

Dr. Hudson's study, entitled "Charter Provisions on Human Rights in American Law," was included as an appendix to the petition in advance of its publication in the legal press.

Dr. Hudson's central point was that while treaties were, under the Constitution, "the supreme law of the land," the only features of treaties that were automatically incorporated into American law were "self-executing" provisions that did not call for legislative implementation.

DECISION BY MARSHALL CITED

The California court's ruling, he said, "was based on a misconception of the human-rights provisions of the Charter." The several sections of the Charter dealing with human rights and nondiscrimination, he added, were variously statements of purpose and definitions of powers and responsibilities of different United Nations segments, none of which imposed any specific obligation on individual member nation beyond cooperation.

He quoted Chief Justice John Marshall, in the Foster against Neilson decision of 1829, as follows:

"A treaty * * * is to be regarded in courts of justice as equivalent to an act of the legislature whenever it operates of itself without the aid of any legislative provision, but when * * * either of the parties engages to perform a particular act, the treaty addresses itself to the political, not the judicial department; and the legislature must execute the contract before it can become a rule for the court."

Noting that some Charter provisions regarding the United Nations' legal status, privileges, and immunities might be considered to have been incorporated in the laws of New York City and therefore now be self-executing, Dr. Hudson continued:

"Clearly, however, the Charter's provisions on human rights have not been incorporated into the law of the United States because they are not self-executing."

The human rights and fundamental freedoms mentioned in the Charter, he added, were not defined therein. He quoted the late Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., as chief of the United States delegation to the San Francisco Charter Conference:

"Because the United Nations is an organization of sovereign states, the General Assembly does not have legislative power. It can recommend, but it cannot impose its recommendations upon the member states."

RIGHTS STATEMENT NOT BINDING

The United Nations' declaration on human rights, also cited by the California court, Dr. Hudson noted, had been specifically excluded at the time of its adoption from the category of a treaty or international agreement and "is in no sense binding on the Government of the United States, and its provisions have not been incorporated in our national law."

"The Human Rights Commission of the United Nations is now engaged in drafting a second instrument—a covenant on human rights," Dr. Hudson commented. "If this covenant is signed and ratified by the United States, and if it is brought into force by a sufficient number of nations, it will be on a wholly different basis from that of the declaration.

"It is designed to be a treaty between various nations. As such, depending on a text which has not yet been finalized, its self-executing provisions might be incorporated into American law; the United States is currently insisting that its provisions should not be self-executing."

The California court, Dr. Hudson suggested, might have been influenced in its opinion by the case of Oyama against California, in which Justices Hugo L. Black and William O. Douglas of the United States Supreme Court "went out of their way to declare: 'There are additional reasons now why that law stands as an obstacle to the free accomplishment of our policy in the international field. One of these reasons is that we have recently pledged ourselves to cooperate with the United Nations to "promote * * * universal respect for an observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." How can this Nation be faithful to this international pledge if State laws which bar land ownership and occupancy by aliens on account of race are permitted to be enforced?'

"Clearly," Dr. Hudson said in conclusion, "a court is not the appropriate agency to determine for the Government of the United States the particular way in which it should 'cooperate with the United Nations.'"

CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICE—LETTER FROM EDWARD KEATING

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter concerning the devastation which will result from the Postmaster General's recent order to increase unemployment and decrease postal service. The writer of the letter is Hon. Edward Keating, a distinguished former Member of the House of Representatives, and now the editor of Labor, the most widely circulated and one of the most important of the world's labor papers.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR,
Washington, D. C., May 13, 1950.

Senator M. M. NEELY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEELY: I have a good deal of sympathy for Postmaster General Donaldson. Our newspaper Labor has never protested against an increase in postal rates.

We have felt the Postmaster General's original recommendation provided for rates which were too high. However, we believed Congress would make a proper adjustment and that we should not add to the Postmaster General's woes.

We still maintain that attitude, but I confess Mr. Donaldson's order restricting service has been a shock to us.

As you may know, Labor has the largest paid circulation of any labor newspaper in this country, and probably in the world. All our papers are delivered through the mails. We have complied with every suggestion from the Post Office Department calculated to make it easier for the Department to handle our papers. Some of these changes have cost us a good deal of money, but we don't complain about that.

Consider just this one example of the Postmaster General's order: We are informed that copies of Labor will not be handled by the Washington post office between 6 p. m. and 8 a. m. Just why Labor should be barred during those hours is not clear. However, the result will be disastrous for us.

We have a very large circulation on the Pacific coast. Papers for that area are mailed the first thing Wednesday evening and they go out on the Wednesday night train.

Under the Postmaster General's recent order, these papers, destined for the Pacific coast, would probably not go out until Thursday night—a delay of 24 hours. Such a change might mean a 48-hour delay in getting Labor to our readers in some parts of the Pacific coast area, because the papers might arrive at some points on Saturday night and be held over until Monday morning.

In other words, the Postmaster General's order knocks a carefully-arranged schedule into a cocked hat and we can't figure out how Uncle Sam will gain by it.

I hope it will be possible to persuade the Postmaster General to continue the present service until such time as Congress may decide the issue of rates and, of course, the all-important question of appropriations for the Post Office Department.

With every good wish, I remain,
Sincerely,

EDWARD KEATING,
Manager.

SHIPMENT OF ARMS TO ISRAEL AND OTHER COUNTRIES OF THE NEAR EAST

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I consider it imperative that the State Department review immediately the entire question of arms shipments to Israel and other parts of the Near East. Information before us shows there is a definite threat to peace in that area, and we will be recreant to our duty to the infant nation of Israel if we do not face up to this situation in a realistic manner.

In a formal statement to me on this matter early in March, the State Department declared that the United States is not enforcing an embargo on the shipment of arms or munitions from this country to Israel. At the same time, the Department declared its readiness to receive applications from all governments in the Near East, including Israel, for the exportation of military equipment "which is considered necessary for the maintenance of internal order and to provide for legitimate defense requirements." This likewise was declared to be Britain's policy.

Despite such assurances, the fact remains, apparently, that the Arab nations surrounding Israel are continuing to receive arms and munitions from Great Britain in quantities which would seem to go far beyond internal security needs. This is particularly upsetting to Israel because, with a peace treaty still unsigned, the present armistice agreements provide only an armed truce which could readily deteriorate into open warfare at the slightest provocation.

With America's world policy dedicated primarily at the moment to the attainment of world peace, the situation in the Near East is one which demands the immediate attention of our State Department. Certainly in a world divided between democratic and Communist nations the citizens of Israel can be counted definitely as adherents to western ideologies of government. Their millions of dead at the hands of dictator-ruled forces and the unparalleled sufferings of members of their race in both Germany and Russia place them inevitably on the side of democracy and against dictatorship. It is important that the United States help them to retain their national integrity.

While we as a nation bend all our efforts to the winning of peace between western and eastern Europe, it does not seem reasonable or wise that we close our eyes to a situation that not only is a threat to peace in the Near East but which could easily be the explosion that would throw the whole world into a new war.

I am, therefore, presenting anew to Secretary of State Acheson an urgent request that the matter of arms export to all the countries of the Near East be made the matter of diplomatic discussion with Great Britain, the source of Arab arms, and, further, that the United Nations be invited to give attention to this important matter. Israel is our friend, its people are deserving of our wholehearted support, and we must not fail them in the time of greatest need.

KANSAS

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, the oldest newspaper in the State of Kansas is the Leavenworth (Kans.) Times, edited and published by Mr. Daniel R. Anthony III. The training and experience of the staff of this great newspaper reflects a great deal upon Mr. Anthony's proved ability to report and edit the news of the Nation.

I consider it an honor to call to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, an excellent editorial entitled "Kansas" by Mr. R. E. Emberton, news editor, of this prominent and outstanding newspaper.

The fundamental basis of American life rests in our small communities where people live close enough to the soil and sun to know what makes America tick. Mr. Emberton is a native Kansan, active in civic affairs in his community, and has ably expressed the feeling of pride Kansans have in their State.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial inserted in the body of the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KANSAS

Kansas is blessed with a wealth of natural resources. Economic figures and statistics prove this year after year.

Kansas was a vital factor in the settlement and development of the great Middle West. History and events make this a positive statement.

Kansas was the hub around which the wheel of fortune revolved leading to the great

struggle between the States that decided once and for all that the United States was indeed a united nation.

Kansans are proud of Kansas—and for good reason.

In economic, political, and social improvement, the State has always been one that has pointed and led the way. It has never been content to be a follower.

When others think of Kansas they think of sunshine, waving fields of golden wheat and corn. They think of the bountiful prairies that help feed the world.

But the world is now knowing Kansas more and more for other natural resources that affect the economy of the Nation.

Kansas is rich in mineral deposits. It produces oil, gas, coal, salt, and many other things vital to the national existence.

Even large-scale industrialism is finding its way to Kansas because the State is the very heart of the Nation, both from geographic location and diversity of resources.

Yes, Kansas has everything a State could wish to make it great. But its most important asset is its people.

Not just for the many who have achieved world-wide recognition and fame, and it has certainly produced its share of those in science, business, the professions, and statesmanship, but because of the people who make up its communities, its neighborhoods, and its entire population.

Ask a real Kansan why he wants to live in Kansas and his answer will be:

"Because I like the friendly people who live in Kansas."

There can be no better reason to live any place in the world.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, after observing some of the things which happened in the Senate early yesterday afternoon, one might conclude that the Republican Party and the Democratic Party are seeking, each, to claim the credit for the FEPC bill; that is to say, there seems to be a rivalry for the credit, on the part of each of the major political parties. One must have a very inadequate understanding of the history of this country if he is concerned by this rivalry for credit for the bill which now is sought to be presented to the Senate.

In the unfortunate period when the flames of war lighted the skies in America for more than 4 years, our people witnessed, of course, the adoption of the thirteenth amendment to the United States Constitution, followed by the fourteenth amendment, followed by the fifteenth amendment. Many bills were introduced in both the House and the Senate by the then majority party, seeking to establish civil rights for a minority race in the United States, who theretofore had been denied certain civil rights. However, Mr. President, there was never anything comparable to the particular bill which is now on motion sought to be made the unfinished business before the Senate. Not in all the wildest dreams of Charles Sumner or Thaddeus Stevens or Senator Trumbull or in the fertile mind of any of the able men of that time was there any concept of a Fair Employment Practice Commission theory, which is advanced in this bill. They did seek to give to the freed men the right of suffrage and other civil rights, but they did not go to the extreme philosophy which is the basis of this proposed legislation

When the Republicans back in those days—which happily are closed, and should remain closed—were seeking to grant certain civil rights to those who had but recently been freed, generally Senators on this side of the aisle voted against them.

The situation now presented is that both parties are struggling to impress minority groups that they are going to be given certain civil rights, and both are seeking to take the credit.

Among all those who represented the Republican Party back in that unfortunate era in our country's history, there was no one who thought of this particular scheme or, at least, having thought of it, even suggested bringing it forward. Generally speaking, those who called themselves Democrats insisted upon the rights of the States, and fought against the undue concentration of power in the Federal Government.

So, Mr. President, I say there is no need for an unseemly contest between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party to obtain credit for this particular piece of proposed legislation. If any credit is due, it is due to another party, a party which fortunately has not yet succeeded in obtaining any large following, numerically, in the United States. If there is any pride of parentage here involved, it certainly could not go to the Republican Party, and it certainly could not go to the old Democratic Party or to a sound Democratic Party. It can only go to a new party which fortunately is not now very popular in the United States.

Let me say that back many years now past, two suggestions were made on the economic front and on the industrial front. Those two suggestions did not originate, be it said to their credit, in the minds of our Republican friends and did not originate in the minds of Democrats. Both suggestions came from the Communist Party. The first one was that there should be an absolute limitation upon the income of every taxpayer in America. They wanted, of course, in the beginning, to provide a very liberal income, and they finally persuaded the then President of the United States, as a war measure, to recommend a limitation of $25,000 upon the income of any American taxpayer. As I say, that was quite liberal, and, if all Americans could have an income of $25,000 after taxes, no one would protest. But in talking, as a member of the Finance Committee, to the proponents of that measure, I soon discovered that what they really wanted was an outright limitation upon income in America of not to exceed $15,000 a year, with an eagerness to reduce it to $10,000, or even below that.

Anyone with the slightest experience should know that once a limitation is put upon what a man or a woman in this country can earn, by the sheer force of political pressure that amount will be constantly reduced. Why? For what purpose? It will be reduced to the point where there can be no reserves which will build enterprises, which will give jobs to the people. Our Communist friends will then say—indeed, as they intended to say—"Only the state can furnish capital. Only the state can provide jobs. Only the state can keep the wheels of industry turning." That was one of their proposals. I am not talking about a far-distant date; I am talking about the platform of the Communist Party as late as 1928, in the United States.

The Republican Party is not the daddy of FEPC. It may now think it profitable to claim parentage of this thing. The Democratic Party, as we knew it in America—the Democratic Party, indeed, as it always was until present times—cannot claim any parentage for this thing. Every line of the basic philosophy upon which we have stood as a party and made our flight has been opposed to it. Do not rob the Communists of their just credit. I hope there will be no unseemly contest here between Republicans and those on this side of the aisle who call themselves Democrats, and who belong to the Democratic Party, over the authorship of this particular bill. Let us concede it to the Communists.

What was the other proposal the Communist Party advanced on the economic and industrial front? It was that the Government should interfere with the management of industry and private enterprise to the point where industry and private enterprise could not function; when, again, our Communist friends would say, "Government must take over; there is no capital; there are no reserves; there can therefore be no such thing as private enterprise." If government can substitute its will for the will of the manager, the will of the owner, the will of the man who made the enterprise, the man who saved for it, and who is now trying to operate it, then of course the Government will take it over. So I say again, let no unseemly contest be engaged in here between Republicans and Democrats for the parentage of this un-American concept. Let the Commies have it. Let them keep it.

Through the years it has been said that the Finance Committee was a very conservative body. Mr. President, let me say to the Senate and to the American people that if the Senate Finance Committee through the years had not been a very courageous body, a very courageous group of Senators, our economy long since would have passed under the control of the State, through these two particular programs, borrowed from the Communist platform of 1928. Read where they proposed to put an absolute limitation upon the earnings of the American taxpayer, the earnings of the American citizen, and ask yourself, Mr. President, whether if that program had succeeded there could have been an accumulation of wealth by individuals in this country, whether in their individual capacities or as stockholders in corporate and company enterprises, with which to carry on American business. We are talking now about a shortage of equity capital. We are talking now about creating some sort of new lending

agencies and banking institutions to help small business. Even the President is talking about it. No doubt the Congress will pass legislation of that type.

Mr. President, if a limitation were placed upon what a man can earn, with the constant temptation of the demagog to reduce that amount to the vanishing point, there would be no equity capital and there would be no possibility of equity capital. We are not really going to help small business merely by providing easy credit for it. I know that credit is often necessary. Frequently it enables an enterprise to get started and to keep going. But we are not going to help small business until we make it possible for small business, out of its earnings, to retain enough to pay its debts and to go ahead. Suppose credit were made easy for small business, through the RFC or through any other arrangements that might be made. What would be accomplished? Would it enable small business, under the heavy burden of taxation now resting upon it, to pay off the debt?

But that is aside from the point, Mr. President. If the second proposal of the Communists, that we must substitute political judgment and control for the judgment and control of the owners of business, had prevailed, then, of course, the free-enterprise system would have passed out of existence. We cannot have free enterprise unless the owners, the responsible managers of legitimate businesses themselves, are given the power to direct those businesses, subject always to the control of government if power be abused, if crimes and frauds be committed, and subject always to just regulation by government in order to prevent such frauds and crimes against society.

So, again, Mr. President, I hope there will not be any unseemly contest between the Republicans and the Democrats over the authorship of this bill. Some persons are nervous lest the bill may be passed by the votes of those on the other side of the aisle, and the successful advocates of the measure will go into the next election claiming credit for it. The Republicans were never the daddy of this proposed legislation. Those who call themselves Democrats, whether they be New Dealers, Fair Dealers, or what not, were never the daddy of this thing. It came out of communism. It is a basic communistic concept.

There are many good men who support it, and there are many good women who support it because of the humanitarian appeal which it has. They say, "Why should we not make it a crime to discriminate against anyone on account of his race or his color or his religion or his national origin?" That is a very strong appeal, of course, addressed to the sympathetic heart of any American. But we must examine it. We must see what it means. So I looked at the bill and found among the three primary purposes to be promoted, and, consequently, the three foundations which support this proposed legislation, the final and principal one, which is as follows:

(iii) To promote universal respect for, and observance of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race or religion, in accordance with the undertaking of the United States, under the United Nations Charter, and to further the national policy in that regard by securing to all persons under the jurisdiction of the United States effective recognition of certain of the rights and freedoms proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in the universal declaration of human rights.

Mr. President, I would not myself sponsor any bill in the Senate if I had to make my appeal for its legality and validity based upon the provisions of the United Nations Charter, especially if I had to invoke the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in support of it. We have never ratified the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Once we do ratify it, if it is ever done, under the inferences of the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States we shall have changed, actually changed, if that Court should permit it to be changed, the character of the Government of the United States.

So, Mr. President, the Republicans did not "daddy" the thing, and the Democrats did not "daddy" it nor "mammy" it. The Communists are entitled to the credit.

Mr. President, I supported the United Nations Charter, but I had in mind that we were trying to preserve peace in the world, to preserve the security of the world. I did not have in mind that we were robbing the States of their reserved powers. I did not have in mind that we were establishing an instrumentality under which we could destroy this Nation under the Constitution and substitute some sort of treaty which the Communists participated in formulating and presenting to the world.

If the Communists did not think up this scheme, they would be the simplest group of persons on earth, because their whole program is to throw into confusion and break down the processes of free enterprise and capitalism in order to put the burden on the Government so that it will take over as the political manager of business, commerce, industry, and what-have-you, in this country.

Mr. President, I am speaking rather plainly, but I am speaking very earnestly.

I see the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is present, and I wish, therefore, to read his individual views on this bill. I must say that the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio presented a bill himself, but not a bill primarily based upon a drastic criminal statute. It was a bill seeking voluntary assistance and a voluntary approach to the elimination, so far as possible, of prejudice in the employment of workers. Here is what the distinguished Senator from Ohio had to say about the bill which we have been discussing:

The committee has reported a bill without recommendation, without hearings, and with almost no consideration in executive session.

Undoubtedly that is true. It has been repeated by my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and no one has controverted it. The statement of the distinguished Senator from Ohio is warrant of the truth of the statement. I read further:

Nor did the committee give any consideration to the bill which I introduced, S. 2994.

I believe that is the correct number; at least, it is the number here stated. I read further:

I have no recourse, therefore, except to urge its consideration on the floor of the Senate.

That is the position of the Senator from Ohio. It is an understandable position, and I am offering no criticism whatever of the statement made by the distinguished Senator.

This bill establishes a Federal commission of five—

I think that has reference to the Senator's bill. I read further:

I feel that the compulsory provisions of the bill reported by the committee without recommendation will hinder progress toward solving the problem rather than achieve it.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio was never more correct in any statement he ever made to his fellow citizens.

Few realize how extensive these compulsory provisions are.

Referring to the bill which is now sought to be made the unfinished business of the Senate.

They are modeled on the unfair-labor-practice provisions of the National Labor Relations Act, and give to anyone who is refused employment or dismissed from a job the right to bring an action against the employer, alleging some motive of discrimination because the applicant or employee is white, black, Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Czech, Pole, or German. Such motives are always possible to allege, and the question is left for decision to a board which is bound by no rules of evidence, and practically not subject to court review.

That statement is absolutely true—"bound by no rules of evidence."

Yet there is a coalition in this body to bring the bill up and make it the unfinished business, presumably for the purpose of passing it. The Senator from Ohio is quite right when he continues: "and practically not subject to court review."

Let me pause to say that the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio omitted a statement which I think is quite significant; namely, that under the procedure established by the bill trial by jury is abolished.

An American citizen who happens to own a business and who is charged with having discriminated against someone on account of his or her race, religion, creed, or national origin, is deprived of the right of trial by jury. Do Republicans want to bring up such a bill as that?—"and practically not subject to court review."

That is absolutely correct. Through the past eventful years we have provided by law authority for regulations and for trial under those regulations. If there is any evidence to sustain a finding of a bureau, a commission, the courts leave it alone. It is true that the courts have made those decisions, but we passed the laws.

Reading further from the statement on this bill by the distinguished Senator from Ohio:

> Abuses which come about under similar provisions of the National Labor Relations Act led to demands for its amendment by labor organizations themselves. As I see it, the compulsory act, if duplicated in every State as its proponents plan, will finally force every employer to choose his employees approximately in proportion to the division of races and religions in his district, because that will be his best defense to harassing suits.

That would be the employer's only final defense. He would have to ascertain the population of all minority races, religions, sects, and creeds in his community, and select his employees in the proportion in which those races are represented in his community or district. The Senator from Ohio is again correct. His logic is above possible criticism. Let me repeat it:

> Abuses which come about under similar provisions of the National Labor Relations Act led to demands for its amendment by labor organizations themselves. As I see it, the compulsory act, if duplicated in every State as its proponents plan, will finally force every employer to choose his employees approximately in proportion to the division of races and religions in his district, because that will be his best defense to harassing suits.

Let me read further:

> Race and religion will enter into every decision. Catholic institutions, for instance, will have to employ Protestants. The Methodist Book Concern will have to employ Catholics. White waiters and porters could insist upon most of the work in the pullman sleepers and dining cars. In the long run this Board would tell every employer how he must make up his labor force. The bill even includes national origin and ancestry, so that in a city like Cleveland, Ohio, employers could be sued by representatives of every nationality group particularly if they do not have members of that nationality employed in the particular office or plant.

That is the bill which Republicans and Democrats wish to take up and make the unfinished business of the Senate, at a time when national unity is essential at home and abroad, and at a time when America should be thinking along constructive lines.

I read a little further from the statement of the Senator from Ohio:

> In my opinion any such compulsory measure will create more bad racial and religious feeling than any other method which can be pursued. I think it will do the colored race much more harm than good. Progress against discrimination must be made gradually and must be made by voluntary cooperation and education with encouragement from a Federal board, like that I propose, and State governments and boards, and not by inviting thousands of lawsuits which will get beyond the control even of the Fair Employment Practices Commission itself.

The Senator from Ohio is entirely correct, except I dare add that we would make much faster and greater progress along right lines if the Federal Government kept its hands off. I am not so sure that we would not make greater progress if State governments kept their hands off and let the American people work out the problem as they have always worked out their troublesome problems.

I read further from the statement of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio:

> A voluntary commission can develop different kinds of plans to increase good colored employment in different cities after studying the local conditions and the character of local industries. The method of solving the problem of Negro full employment in Cleveland may be entirely different from that which should be pursued in New York City or in Atlanta, Ga.

That statement is true, of course.

The Senator adds:

> No scientific study of the problem has yet been made, and that should be the first task of the boards I propose.

I shall not read further from the distinguished Senator's statement on the bill. I think I have read sufficient to convince any fair-minded man that this is not the kind of bill which ought to be taken up and made the unfinished business of the Senate, with the resulting confusion and disorder, and with the resulting delay of legislative programs which should be considered before this session comes to an end.

Mr. President, I have one other word to say. I do not care to enter upon a discussion of the merits of the proposal, but I wish to say that here is a bill reported out without hearings. Long hearings in the past will not suffice. Conditions may have changed; indeed, conditions are constantly changing. The bill was reported, not by a majority vote with recommendation, but it was reported to the Senate without any recommendations from the committee itself. It comes before us as a new proposal thrown on the desk here, a bill which we are now asked to make the unfinished business of the Senate.

Everyone knows the highly explosive character of this proposal. It is certainly not a wise course that is proposed, whoever is responsible for it, but I again express the hope that there will be no particular credit to the Democratic Party or to the Republican Party if the bill shall be forced through at this session of the Senate. I again say that while I do not love them at all, I do not want to see the Communists robbed of any of their just dues, or any of the programs to which they have stood committed, and will always be committed, so long as they are against capitalism, so long as they seek to tear down private enterprise, so long as they seek to substitute the judgment of politicians for the judgment of men and women who have earned and saved until they have built an enterprise and provided jobs for their fellow citizens.

Mr. President, antidiscrimination bills seem most dangerous to the very purpose which they are designed to serve. They bring into a complicated question of human and social relationships, not religion, not education, or freedom, but compulsion. They endeavor to establish a rule for such relationships by congressional fiat.

Predictions are dangerous, but experience of the past has indicated again and again that an attempt to change customs and attitudes and prejudices by statute, particularly a drastic criminal statute, creates greater evils and produces more violent emotions and reactions and prejudices than those they seek to cure.

Therefore, the bill we are discussing raises a fundamental issue of government, not in the legalistic and narrow sense, but in the historical, the broad, the true sense. It is directly opposed to the theory of government which found its great expression in the Bill of Rights and in the fourteenth amendment. There the prohibition was on the State against interference with religion, with life, with liberty, with the pursuit of happiness which is based upon the possibility of the ownership and control of property. Now the proposal is that the compulsion should be by the State on its citizens.

Once adopt this philosophy, and we accept the philosophy of totalitarian government. If it is a proper function of the State to compel its citizens to follow certain principles as to race, creed, color, or national origin, in deciding whom they shall employ or whom they shall admit to union membership, the State can at some future date compel its citizens to adopt other and quite different and quite contrary principles. If the State can compel nondiscrimination, it can compel discrimination.

It is not necessary to point to the example of Nazi Germany to see what can happen once the State is recognized as the arbiter of human and social and religious relationships. The founders of our Government had seen what could happen if the State assumed this role. They knew what happened in the field of religion as a result of attempts to compel adherence to what the State considered desirable principles. They resolved that our Government should not assume such powers, no matter how desirable the object might seem. We have now come full swing around. Any fair-minded person hopes that discriminations of all kinds will become less, but the lesson of the past is that human attitudes and human emotions and human prejudices cannot be changed by compulsion. If the compulsion is that of the State, through drastic criminal laws, we embark on a dangerous sea. With the best of intentions, we adopt, not a charter of liberty, but a charter of totalitarianism.

Electing a man to high public office cannot endow him with either character or wisdom. At most, it can give him power, power to do good or to do evil to his people. The Constitution does not list human virtues, such as compassion, charity, due respect for one's fellow man, as qualifications to be prescribed by Government. These virtues are in fact personal and voluntary. They are the results of religion, of long education, of culture. Government can punish crime by force, but it cannot create in the heart or the mind of any man or any woman the right attitude toward his or her fellow beings. At best, through force it can create only fear and breed suspicion, and ultimately disloyalty. Certainly, at this time we need unity, full understanding,

full cooperation, at home, and with free peoples everywhere.

Government with us is grounded on individual freedom, personal responsibility, and equality before the law, for all citizens, employers as well as employees.

I have heard it asserted in this debate that the proponents of this measure were seeking equal opportunity for all American citizens. I deny that. I condemn it as a misleading misstatement. They are not seeking equal opportunity for all citizens; they are seeking special opportunities for the group of citizens that has more votes than the other group.

A man must be foolish if he does not know that there are more people who have less than the relatively few people who have more. Certainly it is not sought to secure equal opportunity for the employer. Whether those who father the bill intend it or not, a natural result of the legislation, if it should be passed and finally sustained and enforced, would be to procure special privileges for the larger voting element of two groups, the employers and the employees.

Opposition to the consideration of the FEPC bill does not grow out of hostility to any race or to any religion. It is, however, inspired by opposition to creeds such as communism, which seek to divide our people, to destroy our business and industry, so that in the resulting confusion we will become impotent at home and abroad. One certain effect of the proposal will be to create confusion and to destroy the effectiveness of our economy.

At the State level the proposal may be enforcible, and there are honorable Senators who will say that such a law is working very well in certain States. The law may operate well at the State level, but do we not know that the one basic principle in preserving human freedom is local control, local self-government administered by local authority, responsible to a local constituency? Certainly such legislation may be tried out locally, and no one would say no to it.

But when attempt is made to elevate it to the national level, and to extend it by the vast power of the Commission all over the United States, if the attempt should succeed, then there would be set up an instrumentality of tyranny and of oppression, and in the hands of those who are most devoted to alien doctrines—I do not say all those who now advocate the bill fall in this category—but by those who are most devoted to such doctrines and the basic thought underlying them, it would be an instrumentality which would so cripple, so hogtie our free-enterprise system as to make inevitable intervention by Government and the taking over of key industries and natural resources.

Mr. President, at this point I think I shall conclude what I have to say today, because I do not care to go very far into the discussion of the merits of the proposal. I come back again to the simple statement: Why force this measure before the Senate at this time? Can it possibly be productive of any good? It is a bill which never had the affirmative vote of even a majority of the committee, a bill reported to the Senate without hearings, as the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has declared in his written statement. It is a bill which received practically no consideration even in executive sessions. Why force that bill before the Senate? Why make that bill the unfinished business, Mr. President, to the sacrifice of other legislative programs which ought to be considered?

Mr. President, before I take my seat, if the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] desires me to do so, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum. I leave the decision to him, however.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question before he makes that suggestion?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield for a question. I must leave the Senate Chamber shortly. However, I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall present the question, and possibly some of the Senator's colleagues may answer it. The Senator suggests that some of us who are supporting the legislation may be thinking in political terms. As one Member of the Senate I wish to say to the Senator from Georgia that the whole subject gives me great distress and great difficulty. I have high regard for the Senator from Georgia, and I appreciate the sincerity with which he has presented his case. I am very much impressed with it. I always have been, but I want to ask the Senator a simple question. If there are some of us who do sincerely believe in equality of opportunity in education and equality of economic opportunity in this country, what is the way to achieve it? I am troubled by that thought. During my recent trip in the Far East I became very much impressed by the yearning of peoples of all races for freedom from superimposed authority, from classification as second-rate citizens. I found that they were seeking some way to get away from the superimposed shackles of what have heretofore been imperialism and colonialism. I think it is one of the great issues in the world today; I am yearning to receive an answer to that question.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree with the Senator, but human likes and dislikes, and prejudices, if you please, are not among the great tryannies of the world. It may be conceded that they are common traits among mankind. There is no need to get away from them at all but we should get away from all those things which are in conflict with virtue and the right attitude toward one's fellowman. That can be accomplished through religion, education, by long culture of the individual and of the race. Those are the only means by which we can get away from such things. Let me make clear, however, that I do not believe in absolutism. That is the point at which I part company with my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Jersey. I say with all respect to him that I part company with him at that point. I do not believe that government has any power to enter this field, and undertake to control likes and dislikes, and enforce a choice as between one employee and another who might wish to become employed. I do not believe the Government can enter that field. There are some things which have not been committed to the kind of government we have in America. Indeed the whole Bill of Rights is an attempt to assert the immemorial rights of freemen which are over and above all government, local or general. Therefore I do not believe in absolutism. I myself do not undertake to point out how government can make a man be good or Christian or tolerant, because government cannot do so. If government undertakes to do so it becomes a tyranny.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I agree with the Senator entirely in the thought that people cannot be made good by legislation. But let us assume for the purpose of argument that discrimination existed in respect to educational opportunities, that there was not equality of educational opportunities, would we not be justified in passing legislation which would insure equality of opportunity for all our people, without regard to race, creed, or color?

Mr. GEORGE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have been opposed to the legal sanctions in the bill, but I think the Commission should study the situation and endeavor, as the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] provides in his amendment, to bring about ways and means by which equality of education and of economic opportunity can be insured. I think we are moving in the right direction.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree with the Senator that it is the duty of government to provide equality of economic opportunity and educational opportunity.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Those are the only things I am arguing for.

Mr. GEORGE. I certainly agree as to that. There can be no question about it. In all our States we must provide equality of opportunity for education. We do not necessarily mean by that, that we favor the mingling of the races in the schools or the colleges.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am not suggesting that.

Mr. GEORGE. However, we do provide, and we are under the compulsion of law to provide, equality of opportunity in matters educational as well as economic.

Let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that I know it is easy enough to say that a certain discrimination exists against certain minorities; but I have never seen a good, industrious, energetic member of a minority race in my State who did not have employment, and profitable employment.

The proposed legislation now being discussed is not the way to overcome whatever evil there is in our system, because, as I have said before, I do not believe in absolutism. The whole theory of our Government is against absolutism, because we recognize that there are limits beyond which the Government cannot go, should not go, and should not attempt to go, and that means local government as well as the Federal Government, because there are powers which

are reserved to the people themselves—indeed, those powers which through the ages they have insisted are superior to the rights and powers of any government over them.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I agree with the Senator from Georgia with respect to his views on absolutism. I am not advocating absolutism.

I now ask the Senator this question: Assuming that this proposed legislation is passed over, as the Senator from Georgia advocates, would he be willing to join with us in seeing by what ways we can assure equality of opportunity in education and in other areas to all our people?

Mr. GEORGE. I would be quite willing to join with all my colleagues, including the Senator from New Jersey, who is a man of integrity and high capacity.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Not only would I be willing to join with them, but I would be willing to do all I can, as I have tried all my life, to bring about equality of opportunity for all our people. In that I thoroughly and basically believe.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his splendid exposition, which is very enlightening.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Jersey leaves the floor, let me say that, speaking only as one Senator from a Southern State, I am grateful for the expressions of moderation and tolerance and of human kindness which have come—and not unexpectedly so—from the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. Let me say to him—and I do not wish to detain him on the floor of the Senate—that I think that out of the sort of approach which he has voiced will ultimately come the solution, so far as laws can bring solutions, of the problems concerning which we speak in this debate.

Before the Senator from New Jersey leaves the floor, let me suggest to him that those of us from some of the Southern States, who in connection with this matter feel so keenly that an approach by law is unsound and that this particular approach under this particular proposed law is unwise and un-American, have not come without some suggestion which leads toward the solution of these problems. I remind the distinguished Senator from New Jersey, for instance, that on the question of the elimination of a poll tax, there are 10 southern Senators who more than a year ago introduced a joint resolution calling for a constitutional amendment on that subject. That joint resolution still languishes in a Senate committee; but if the constitutional amendment thus proposed had been promptly submitted at that time, it would, at least in the judgment of the Senator from Florida, have been well on its way toward adoption by this time, if it had not already been adopted.

Let me also say to the distinguished Senator from New Jersey that repeated assurances have been given on this floor, by southern Senators in the field of anti-lynch legislation, regarding a moderate law which will stand the constitutional test, but will not try to follow the ideology which we think is wholly un-American—that of levying collective damages against an American community which may be so unhappy as to have sustained within its limits a lynching, which all of us deeply deplore, and want to avoid and eliminate by every legal and moral means within our power.

Let me say that on the very question of employment practices, repeated assurances have been given on this floor of willingness to have the subject studied, and repeated assurances have been given on this floor of a stronger effort toward achieving equality of education than any which has been enjoyed heretofore in either the North or the South.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey will recall that the Southern States on their own initiative, through their own means and resources, have launched an interregional program of education which already is bearing heavy fruit, particularly in the way of increased opportunity for higher education in medicine, dentistry, and veterinary science for the members of the Negro race in our section of the country who aspire to the practice of those professions.

The distinguished Senator from New Jersey also will recall that not only have we not been able to get moderate measures reported from the committees, but that every time a moderate measure is mentioned, the minority groups, through leadership which we think is not sound, assert their unwillingness to approach the subject through a moderate or tolerant method. In the very matter of regional education, the Senator from New Jersey will recall that, without his vote, by a majority of one the Senate refused to give its approval, after the House had overwhelmingly approved an interstate compact for regional higher education in the South.

So I simply wish to say to the Senator from New Jersey, for whom I have the deepest affection, and who I know voiced the sincere convictions in his own heart in his remarks of a few minutes ago to the senior Senator from Georgia, that we appreciate his consideration and the evidence of the milk of human kindness which typifies his remarks on this subject, as well as on other subjects; and we on this side of the aisle hope he will persist in seeking an approach which is moderate and which does not seek to solve, through mere laws, problems which cannot be so solved.

So, Mr. President, I express my very deep appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Florida that during all the time I have been in the Senate, I have been hoping against hope that the group from the South who have always opposed the proposals made in an effort to try to bring about equality of opportunity in education, and especially economic opportunity, would offer some program which we could study and on which we could try to cooperate with them. However, I have never seen a program offered which seemed to me to make the position of the individual in this broad land one of safety, protected from the possibilities of abuse. That is what troubles me.

So, although I see the problem being studied, I say that it seems to me the study is not adequate until and unless something is offered which will insure equality of opportunity, both educational and economic, to all our people, despite any differences among them. I think it is most important that we move ahead with a program to solve this problem in the light of world conditions, in which this very issue is involved everywhere.

As I said to the Senator from Georgia, I very recently returned from the Far East, where the yearning is to get away from secondary citizenship. I am making a plea for a program to get away from secondary citizenship everywhere, and especially in our free country. That is my position.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I do not have to remind him that there is presented here in America a very great opportunity to the minority races of the earth and religious creeds which are represented among our citizenship as compared with that which is denied to them elsewhere. I am sure he will feel that we have made great progress, and that we all want to continue to make even greater progress. For instance, contrast the treatment which has been accorded and is still being accorded to the Jews in other countries with the many efforts to obtain opportunities for their advancement and the gaining by them of high position in our Nation and under our system of government. The contrast is all in favor of the American doctrine. When he looks at what has recently happened in India between those of one religious faith and those of another, and will realize that in the course of their troubles there, literally millions of innocent people have lost their lives because of the intolerance, mostly religious intolerance, which prevails there, he must surely see the difference between that situation and what obtains in the United States. When he thinks a moment about what has happened recently, not on one occasion but on several occasions, in South Africa, where men who are black have been fighting with men who are brown, and hundreds of them have lost their lives because of the intolerant hatred which somehow persists in the human mind in so many places of the earth, he will realize that there is a contrast instead of a comparison between the friendly and understanding and human attitude in this Nation between people of different races, and that which prevails there.

When he looks for a moment at what happened in Eritrea or Somaliland but a few weeks ago, where, again, hundreds of people lost their lives, or when he looks at the division between Jew and Arab in

Palestine and in the surrounding regions, I am sure he will have to feel, as the junior Senator from Florida feels very strongly, that under the protection of a government which is trying to be fair to the people of all creeds, the people of this Nation have attained to a greater degree of equality, prosperity, and welfare, working together, than has been attained by any other group of people of varying races and nationalities and religions and colors anywhere else on top side the green earth.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I desire to say with respect to everything the Senator has said, that I agree with him, and I commend the Senator for the approach he makes to the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield further to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield for a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida has the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not wish to lose the floor.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am simply saying, in reply to what the Senator from Florida has just said, which was in reply to my previous question, that I agree with what he has just said, that what we have offered in this country has been beyond anything offered in any other country of the world. We are moving toward a better world. I shall not call it the millennium, because we shall never attain that, but we are moving toward a place where I hope we will set an example against the possibility of secondary citizenship anywhere. That is what I am asking for.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question only.

Mr. LEHMAN. I hope the distinguished and able Senator from Florida realizes that until quite recently, when legislation was passed in the State of New York outlawing discrimination, it was substantially impossible for any man or woman of my faith or for any Negro or member of some of the national minorities to obtain employment in a great many of the banks or public utilities or large industries of the State of New York.

If the Senator will yield for another question, I wonder whether he knows that until President Franklin Roosevelt became governor and I became lieutenant governor, it was substantially impossible for any Negro in the State of New York to get a position even within the civil service. It was only because of our insistence and the legislation which was passed on our recommendation that that situation happily has been corrected.

I point this out not in criticism of the great State which the Senator so ably represents, or of the South; I say it because I feel that without suitable legislation, even in New York, we would not have been able to render justice to minority groups.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator, who, by his very presence on the floor of the Senate, dignifies and does honor to the membership of the Senate, and we are happy to have him here. Incidentally, the first Senator from the State of Florida happened likewise to be a member of the Senator's faith and race, and we are proud of his memory and of his service—the very presence of the Senator from New York shows the tremendous opportunity which is allowed to people of his faith in this Nation. If it be true that in the State of New York State legislation was required in order to assure equality of opportunity, I, for one, could not object to it or find any fault with anyone, either the distinguished Senator or any other citizen, for supporting such legislation there.

Mr. President, and Senators, I wish to address myself briefly—as briefly as I may—to the pending motion to take up Senate bill 1728, the FEPC bill.

First, a brief outline of FEPC, as to what it is. FEPC came into existence in 1941, not as a law, but as an Executive order of President Roosevelt under his war powers, to permit of the more effective furtherance of the war. No legislation was enacted by Congress then, nor has any been since enacted. The purpose of the order was to end discrimination in employment in the Government agencies, and in war plants. The order related, therefore, solely to Government workers and those producing war goods under Government contracts. It made no pretense of including private business or industry. Efforts to create a permanent FEPC covering private industry by Federal legislation failed, both during the war and thereafter, and FEPC died with the war. Latest efforts to enact national FEPC were in the Eightieth Congress, under the Ives bill, S. 984, and in the Eighty-first Congress, under the McGrath bill, S. 1728, the one to which this motion is addressed, and the Lesinski bill, H. R. 4453, the last two being identical administration measures. Of course, the House declined to pass H. R. 4453 in February of this year, but did pass a drastically amended bill from which the enforcement provisions were stricken.

We are now debating a motion to take up and consider, not the watered-down measure which passed the House last February, but the original administration bill as introduced in the Senate, S. 1728.

Before discussing any of the issues presented by the bill, I wish to again call attention to the unusual fact that this bill was placed on the calendar without hearing and remained on the calendar without benefit of a committee report or recommendation from October 17, 1949, until Friday, May 5, 1950—the day the motion now being debated was made—when a report was filed, though the same was not printed and available until sometime Monday, May 8, the very day this debate commenced.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator know of any time in this Congress when a controversial piece of legislation, of which this is an example, has been brought before the Senate without committee hearings, especially when there were Senators and other persons who desired to be heard in connection with that type of legislation?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida does not know of any such incident, either in this Congress or in any other Congress, and no such situation has been presented. In further answer, I should like to say to my friend, it seems to me that there was a peculiar necessity for a hearing in this particular case and on this bill, not only because of the vital importance of the contents of the bill, but because, since the hearing on the last bill, in the Eightieth Congress, was concluded, there have been so many efforts made in so many States of the Union to adopt State FEPC laws, which were bitterly contested by members of the legislature, by business, by labor unions, and by ordinary citizens, and in more than a dozen States, as will appear later from my remarks, those measures were defeated. Certainly the problem was being developed through such defeat, and the attitude of the citizens was being shown through such repeated defeats.

It would seem to the junior Senator from Florida that it would be the part of necessity as well as the part of decency, to allow fellow Members of the Senate to be heard, and to allow the many groups of citizens, who were so concerned about similar measures pending in State legislatures, to make clear their reasons for fearing the adoption of such legislation and for taking the position, which they did strongly take, that the legislation was un-American, unwise, and communistic, and posed grave threats to the Nation and its institutions. To have shut off those particular persons representing many States, many industries, many labor unions, without giving them the slightest oportunity to be heard, appears to the Senator from Florida to have been a veritable travesty as well as a tragedy.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator, and I completely agree with him on that point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I may say, in the first instance, that no one sponsoring this bill, so far as I have been able to discover, thinks that by itself it answers the legislative part of the problem. In other words, no one thinks that the question of interstate commerce, which is the only slender peg on which the advocates of the measure can hang any semblance of Federal jurisdiction, covers the whole problem, but, to the contrary, every advocate whose testimony I have been able to find makes it clear that such legislation, if it were passed, would be simply supplemental to State legislation and even local legislation in various areas of the Nation.

Without laboring the question, Mr. President, I should like to quote the testimony of one of the leading advocates of the bill, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], whose tesimony on the subject appears at page

100 of the House hearings on House bill 4453:

> This is not to say that national legislation is to replace local and State laws. On the contrary, it is my understanding that H. R. 4453, which you are discussing, specifically provides that the Federal Commission for Fair Employment Practices may cede jurisdiction to the appropriate local body where the local or State laws are sufficient to carry out standards of equality in employment opportunities.
>
> In other words, Mr. Chairman, I say that any Federal law that we adopt should have within it a provision which states that where a State law that meets certain national standards has been passed or where a local law that meets these national standards has been passed, the jurisdiction should go right down to the State and the local government, because it will be more humanly administered, the people will know the other people, and they will do a better job of administration.

Mr. President, before concluding the quotation from the testimony of the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota, I may say I thoroughly agree that the law would be more humanly administered by the State or local government. It is quite apparent that the Senator from Minnesota visualized the situation in which the States and communities which saw fit to pass legislation of their own, of as high standards as those in any Federal law, or even higher, would be allowed to run their own business. But, Mr. President, there is implicit in the statement, as there is in the bill, the fact that in those great portions of the Nation where States have refused to pass such laws, where cities have not even dreamed of passing city ordinances on the subject, not more human administration, as mentioned by the Senator from Minnesota, but some other type of administration, certainly less human—and I shall not use any words of my own to characterize it—would seek to enforce upon the sovereign will of the people of the great majority of the States of the Union, who have so far been unwilling to believe that FEPC is at all a proper subject for legislation to enforce upon them administration by Federal agencies, with the long arm of the Federal law.

Those of us who are familiar with the report of the President's Civil Rights Committee and with the many bills which have been introduced know that the proponents do not want to have enforcement through the local district attorney or the local FBI officers in the various States. The proponents of the bill want, instead, to have a central force, in the nature of a gestapo, established, not only to look into things which may cause trouble, but, ahead of time, as is made clear in the report of the President's Civil Rights Committee, to keep in touch with every community and every person from whom any trouble could be anticipated, so that it could be prevented in advance. If anyone can describe those activities any more fittingly than they are described in the report of the President's Civil Rights Committee, I should like him to do so.

I continue the quotation from the statement of the Senator from Minnesota:

> Federal legislation, then, should set the basic national pattern, and local laws may be enacted, or ought to be enacted, to apply the pattern to groups which cannot be appropriately covered by national legislation. Furthermore, State and local government can and should legislate to raise the standards for their areas above the minimum established by the National Government as far as the social development in those areas permits.

Mr. President, I have quoted from the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, not at all because I agree with his philosophy, but because he makes it very clear, speaking as one of the leading advocates of the measure, that by no means does he intend by this bill to occupy the whole field of legislation, but, to the contrary, he hopes for the passage of much stricter State and local laws, and he lays the predicate in this bill. There are certain provisions in the bill itself by which the Federal agency could pass on and delegate all its powers to State and local agencies for enforcement in their particular geographic areas.

So, Mr. President, I think, when we realize that it must be very clear that this is not a southern problem, but a national problem—it is not a Federal problem but it is a State problem as well—and that even the advocates of the measure recognize the fact that it is a State and local problem, we can understand that they expect to have supplementary State and local legislation along with any national legislation which may be passed.

Mr. President, before leaving the point that this is not a southern problem, but a national problem, and also a State problem in every State, I should like to remind the Senate that the Democratic platform gives some evidence of the fact that various States had different positions, as represented by their delegates to the Democratic Convention at Philadelphia, in 1948, and that the attitudes and convictions of those various delegates, speaking for their States, showed up very clearly on that occasion in the adoption of the platform plank on this subject. Every Senator knows that the proposal which came from the platform committee was not adopted. Instead, a minority report on the subject was adopted.

Before going into the subject further it should be made clear at this time that there was great difference of opinion as to the wisdom and propriety of the adoption of the minority report, and that it was adopted by a very close vote. The minority report, which is the so-called civil-rights plank in the Democratic Party platform of 1948, was adopted by the close vote of 651½ to 582½. I repeat those figures, 651½ to 582½. It is interesting to note that the entire vote of many of the Eastern States was cast in favor of the resolution, including, for instance, the entire vote of the State of New York, 98 votes; the entire vote of Massachusetts, 36 votes; the entire vote of Connecticut, 20 votes, and the entire vote of New Jersey, 36 votes. Senators know that those four States have adopted State FEPC laws. It is quite apparent that because of their enthusiasm for their State laws the delegates from those States in the Democratic Convention felt they could properly cast their entire vote for the adoption of the Federal FEPC plank, which is of such far-reaching force and effect.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that if the State of New Jersey alone, with its 36 votes, had changed its vote from one side to the other, namely, if it had voted against the plank, the Democratic civil-rights plank would not have been adopted. If the State of Massachusetts alone had changed its vote from one side to the other, the plank would not have been adopted. Similarly, of course, if the State of New York had changed its vote, the plank would not have been adopted, but would have been soundly beaten.

It is quite evident that the States which have State FEPC laws dominated the picture at the convention, and that through their votes alone—and there were 180 votes from those four States—the measure was thrust down the throats of a very large and very vocal minority, which cast 582½ votes against the adoption of the plank.

Mr. President, without trying to cover the field more fully, I should like to say that quite a number of the great Midwestern States and some other Atlantic States took the same position. For instance, the State of Illinois, with 60 votes, in spite of the fact that it had repeatedly turned down the adoption of a State FEPC law, cast its 60 votes in favor of the plank. The State of Michigan, with 42 votes, in spite of the fact that it had consistently turned down State FEPC legislation, cast its entire vote in favor of the plank. Likewise, the State of Pennsylvania, with 74 votes, voted its block of 74 votes in favor of the adoption of the plank. It should be noted that Pennsylvania has for three successive legislative terms turned down proposed FEPC legislation in such a way that no one can have any question as to whether the good people of that State want that kind of legislation.

It is interesting to note that some of these States did not even count on the Democratic side when it came to the election in November. I cannot recall any electoral votes coming for the Democratic ticket in the fall of 1948, from the State of New York. I cannot recall that any electoral votes came from the State of Connecticut, from New Jersey, and others of these great States.

Mr. President, it is perfectly apparent that the plank which was adopted at the Democratic Convention in Philadelphia was adopted as a result of a battle between State delegations, and that the FEPC States prevailed. It is also quite apparent that for some undisclosed reason delegations from many States which had declined over and over again to adopt State FEPC legislation nevertheless cast their votes in favor of the adoption of the FEPC plank in the platform.

Mr. President, I think it is enlightening to note that of the Senators who have already spoken in favor of bringing up the FEPC bill for debate and making it the unfinished business four are from FEPC States. Five addresses have been made by the proponents of

the bill. The first speech was made by the distinguished Senator from Utah, the chairman of the committee [Mr. THOMAS]. The other four were made by Senators from States which have adopted State FEPC laws. They are the senior Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. Those are the Senators who have spoken in support of the measure.

Of those of us who do not desire to see this legislation come up for consideration, much less have it adopted, I will be the fifth speaker, I believe. I note with some surprise that among that group there is not a single Senator who comes from the large number of States which have rejected State FEPC legislation. The five Senators who have spoken against the measure are the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the junior Senator from Florida. Mr. President, I think it is worth while to consider what has happened in States outside of the South and to ask with wonderment why Senators who speak for the large number of States which have consistently and continuously refused to adopt State FEPC legislation have not made the convictions of their own States heard in this body up to this time.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Certainly it would seem to me, and I wonder if the distinguished and very able junior Senator from Florida would not agree with me, that unless there is really some compelling reason for it, legislation should not be forced onto the people of States who have expressed their own will against such legislation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I fully and thoroughly agree with the Senator from Louisiana. I wonder at the temerity of Senators from the comparatively few FEPC States who have dominated the debate in favor of this particular legislation. They argue that because eight States have seen fit to adopt FEPC laws such legislation must be good for the Nation as a whole. They ignore the fact that 19 sovereign States have voted it down conclusively, and that many other States including, of course, Southern States, have refused to give the matter sufficient consideration even to bring it before their legislatures.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Would it not seem to the distinguished and able Senator from Florida that in the case of Senators from States where such legislation was rejected, especially where it was rejected by their people at referenda, the people going to the polls to reject this type of legislation, there would be more compulsion on such Senators to oppose this type of obnoxious legislation than there would be upon those of us who come from States in which the people have never expressed themselves on it?

Mr. HOLLAND. It might seem so, I will say to the able Senator from Louisiana. At the same time, I think every Senator must decide the question for himself. I am simply listening with avid heart and with a hope which still continues that before the debate is over we shall hear vocal expression in opposition to the consideration of this measure at this time from some of the Senators from the 19 States who have rejected State FEPC legislation and have expressed themselves as against its wisdom and against its philosophy.

Mr. President, I should first like to mention briefly the eight States which have adopted State FEPC legislation. They are good States. I have no quarrel with them. I have no quarrel with the men who represent them so ably in the Congress of the United States. I think those men, whether in the Senate or in the House, have a full right to speak for the convictions of their people and for the actions of their people as taken through the governments in their respective States in the enactment of State FEPC legislation.

The States which have adopted FEPC legislation are the good States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Washington, a total of eight States in all, with a total population of 27,736,309, according to the 1940 census, the last completed Federal census. I may say, before going further, that I have tried to bring these figures forward to the latest estimates of the Census Bureau, although no figures for 1950 are yet available, and I find that in no substantial way is the proportion changed between the groups of States which I shall mention in my remarks.

Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that the eight States which have adopted FEPC legislation are shown in red on the map which is on the floor of the Senate. Of the eight States shown, five are more or less contiguous to New York, and the others are New Mexico, where, of course, the Spanish and Mexican people are a large part of the population, and the two good States in the far Northwest, Washington and Oregon. Those are the only States which have adopted State FEPC legislation of a compulsory nature.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that, as I have stated, those States have a total population of 27,736,309 people, of the roughly 131,000,000 people in the Nation at the time of the taking of the 1940 census.

At this time I should like to submit as a part of my remarks a list of the eight States I have just mentioned which have adopted compulsory FEPC laws, and which are the only States which have adopted such laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

States adopting compulsory FEPC

	1940 population		
	White	Negro	Other races
1. Connecticut	1,675,407	32,992	843
2. Massachusetts	4,257,596	55,391	3,734
3. New Jersey	3,931,087	226,973	2,105
4. New Mexico	492,312	4,672	34,834
5. New York	12,879,546	571,221	28,375
6. Oregon	1,075,731	2,565	11,388
7. Rhode Island	701,805	11,024	517
8. Washington	1,698,147	7,424	30,620
Total	26,711,631	912,262	112,416
Grand total, 27,736,309.			

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, Senators will note that there are two States shown upon the map which, though they are colored in blue, have yet an entering wedge of red shown on them, the good States of Indiana and Wisconsin. I may say briefly that this is the history of FEPC legislation in those two good States. There was an attempt in both of them, in the beginning, to have compulsory FEPC laws adopted. Instead, the best the legislatures would do for the proponents of that type of legislation was to adopt voluntary FEPC laws, without any compulsory features, and I may say, with very limited appropriations and personnel to make a study of the employment situations confronting the people in the two States of Indiana and Wisconsin.

Mr. President, the reason why those States are shown in blue, except for the red wedges which appear in them, is that since the time indicated additional efforts have been made to force upon those States and their people compulsory State FEPC laws, and those efforts have been defeated in both the State of Indiana and in the State of Wisconsin.

The voluntary laws existing in those States have proved to be of such limited effect, practically of no effect at all, that the majority of the Senate committee in its report on this very bill, which was filed at the time of the beginning of the debate now taking place upon this floor, saw fit to include these words referring to the voluntary FEPC laws in Wisconsin and Indiana:

> While the voluntary laws in Wisconsin and Indiana are already almost forgotten (the Indiana commission has not even filed a report in over 2 years).

Then the committee in its report goes on to other matters. I repeat that reference to the voluntary laws in those two States, showing of what nugatory effect they have been, at least up to this time, because the Senate will recall that this report was filed on May 5, 1950, and in printed form it became available to the Members of the Senate only late in the day the debate actually began, a week ago Monday. I quote again the words from the committee report:

> While the voluntary laws in Wisconsin and Indiana are already almost forgotten (the Indiana commission has not even filed a report in over 2 years).

Mr. President, for the purpose of showing the Senate and the public what has been done by way of rejecting compulsory FEPC legislation, we have had very carefully compiled by the Library of Congress, and shown in the form of the map to which I have already referred, indicated in blue, the States throughout the Nation which have rejected FEPC State laws of a compulsory nature. There are 19 of those States. As the Senate will see, they are located from the eastern seaboard to the Pacific. They include every one of the six greatest States of the Union in population which come immediately after the State of New York, which, of course, itself is the leader in population in the Nation. In other words, of the six greatest States in population other than New York, namely, the States of Pennsylvania, Michigan, Illinois, Ohio, California, and Texas, none has adopted compulsory State FEPC legislation. To the contrary, five of them—being all six of the States I have mentioned except the State of Texas—have had the program repeatedly up in their State legislatures, and have declined to adopt State FEPC legislation, instead frowning upon any such un-American set-up. In describing it as un-American, I use not my own words, but words repeated many times in the course of the State debates and in the course of the records made in the consideration of these proposed FEPC laws.

Mr. President, I ask that there may be incorporated in the RECORD a list of the 19 States which have rejected FEPC legislation, and that the list may appear as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

States that have rejected FEPC

	1940 population		
	White	Negro	Other races
1. Arizona	542,920	1,235	6,155
2. California	6,596,763	124,306	186,318
3. Colorado	1,106,502	12,176	4,618
4. Delaware	230,528	35,876	101
5. Illinois	7,504,202	387,446	5,593
6. Indiana	3,305,323	121,916	557
7. Iowa	2,520,691	16,694	883
8. Kansas	1,734,496	65,138	1,394
9. Kentucky	2,631,425	214,031	171
10. Michigan	5,039,643	208,345	8,118
11. Minnesota	2,768,982	9,928	13,390
12. Montana	540,468	1,120	17,868
13. Nebraska	1,297,624	14,171	4,039
14. North Dakota	631,464	201	10,270
15. Ohio	6,566,531	339,461	1,620
16. Pennsylvania	9,426,989	470,172	3,019
17. Utah	542,920	1,235	6,155
18. West Virginia	1,784,102	117,754	118
19. Wisconsin	3,112,752	12,158	12,677
Total	57,884,325	2,153,363	283,064
Grand total, 60,320,752.			

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I simply read for the information of Senators now present which States these are. They are the States shown in blue on the map, the States of Arizona, California, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Utah, West Virginia, and Wisconsin.

It will be noted, Mr. President, that of those 19 States, 17 are completely away from the South, so far away from it that they are not even referred to as border States, whereas two of the States are generally referred to as border States, namely, the States of West Virginia and Kentucky.

The total population of these 19 States which have rejected State FEPC laws is 60,320,752, or considerably more than 2 to 1 greater than the population of the eight States which have adopted compulsory FEPC legislation.

Mr. President, that concludes the two groups which have themselves considered FEPC legislation; one which has adopted the legislation, a group of 8 States, the other a group which has declined to adopt it, a group of 19 States. The disparity in population has already been indicated in my remarks. The States which have rejected FEPC have far more than a 2-to-1 population as compared with those which have accepted it.

In order that the picture may be fully clear I want the Members of the Senate to glance again at the map and to note the fact that in 21 States shown in white upon the map no legislator has even so highly regarded FEPC legislation as to suggest the adoption of it by the introduction of a bill in the State legislature or by the introduction of a proposed constitutional amendment.

Looking at the map Senators will note that the States which have not even considered such legislation may be placed in four different groups. Three of those States are New England States, and fine old New England States, steeped in the traditions of real Americanism. The States are Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, where no member of their legislatures has thought sufficiently highly of FEPC legislation to introduce it into their legislatures.

The second group which I mention is composed of four Western States, the States of South Dakota, Wyoming, Idaho, and Nevada. The same situation obtains there. No legislator in that group of four States has seen fit to introduce any proposed FEPC legislation in any of their legislatures.

The third group comprises three border States, the States of Maryland, Missouri, and Oklahoma. No legislator has introduced FEPC legislation in the legislatures of those States.

By far the largest group is, of course, composed of the 11 States of the Old South, and I do not think I have to advise the Members of the Senate—I do not believe it would be any startling news to them—that no legislator in the 11 legislatures which represent the 11 sovereign States in the Old South, has thought sufficiently highly of the FEPC proposal as a measure of State enactment as to have introduced any such legislation into any of those legislatures.

Mr. President, to conclude my statement with reference to the comparison of population, I simply wish to remind the Senate that the 21 States which I have just mentioned have a combined population of 43,612,214. In 1940 the total population of the 19 States which have rejected FEPC, and the 21 which have not considered FEPC, or 40 States in all, was 103,932,966, as against the 27,736,309 population in the 8 States which have adopted FEPC legislation.

Mr. President, and Senators, I think it will be very clear that only between one-fourth and one-fifth of the population of the whole country reside in the 8 States that have adopted State FEPC legislation.

On the question of what the various States have done in this field, I shall not weary the Senate by producing the record for each State. We have had a study made by the Library of Congress, which shows exactly what has been done in each of these States. It is a record of the introduction of nearly 200 bills and the rejection of those bills by the legislatures of the various States, in such a way as to make it very clear that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the Nation, even without regarding the 21 States which have not considered such legislation, is against this un-American approach to the problem of fair employment practices.

Mr. President, in going back to the question of what has happened in the various States, reference was made by the distinguished Senator from Georgia to the fact that there has been one State in which this matter was entrusted to the people themselves, to pass upon it in a referendum. The legislature refused to act in the great State of California in 1945 and 1946, as I recall—and I have the record and will read it exactly in a moment. Some friends of FEPC legislation saw fit to initiate for the ballot that was to be voted on in the fall of 1946, a proposed constitutional establishment of State FEPC in the State of California. It was a very bitterly fought contest. It was a contest in which apparently the merits and the demerits of the proposed program were made clear to the people of California from one end of the State to the other. I doff my hat to California as being a State which is certainly not a reactionary or standpat State, but which has been in the forefront of progressivism and of true liberalism for these many years, and I hope and believe will always remain in that position.

I may say for the great State of California that there is no State in the Nation which is less provincial than that State, because its people come from literally all over the United States. We of Florida like to think of California and Florida as being in a class somewhat by themselves. If the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], whom I see present, is not in accord with that statement, I would simply regret it. I believe it to be true that the citizenship of the two States is quite comparable in that it comes literally from all over the Nation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement, if he does not lose his rights to the floor by doing so?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say that I have been listening to the very interesting talk the Senator has been making. On behalf of the State of California I wish to express my appreciation for the very high regard in which he holds the

State of California. I agree that both the States of Florida and California represent the Nation as a whole, since we have been fortunate in having come to our respective States people from every State of the Union, who have made very fine citizens.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator, and I am glad to find that the Senator from California and the Senator from Florida are in such full accord in esteeming the high quality of their citizens.

Mr. President, the result of this great election in California, where people from all parts of the country have come to seek living conditions which they could find better than back home, was that 1,682,646 votes were cast against the proposal and 675,697 votes were cast for the proposal. The outcome was approximately a 2½-to-1 vote against a State FEPC for California.

Further, Mr. President, to show that the issue was not determined either solely in the great cities of that great State or solely in the countryside, I want to say that the most impressive thing about the result in that election was that in every county of that great State the voters participating—and they did participate, as can be seen, to a total number of more than two and one-quarter million—cast a substantial majority against the adoption of such FEPC legislation for the State of California.

Mr. President, I shall come back to California a little later. I took up that State first, not simply because the Senator from California was on the floor, though that would have been a sufficient reason, but because unhappily that is the only State in which the sovereign voters have really had a chance, except by indirection, to pass upon this question. In various other States the voters have not been slow to remove from office persons who misrepresented them by trying to foist upon them State FEPC laws.

However, let us go back for a moment to a consideration of some of the other key States which are shown by the report of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to have rejected State FEPC legislation.

Mr. President, if any Senator desires to have me do so, I can discuss any other States in this connection, yet the four States which I shall mention now, in order that the RECORD may show how exhaustive has been the battle in the States where FEPC proposed legislation has been rejected, not once, but over and over again, will be the great, pivotal States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and California, because I believe the RECORD should show the tremendous debates which have been held there at the State level and the rejection which has been accomplished at the hands of the representatives of the people of those four great States, not once, but over and over again, during the years since 1943.

In the case of the State of Pennsylvania, the report of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress shows that it has no positive information on this subject for the year 1945, but it is certain, from the remarks on legislation in later years, that some bills on FEPC were introduced in that year in the Pennsylvania Legislature. The Legislative Reference Service has not been able to include any specific showing on them.

In 1947 two bills were introduced in the Pennsylvania Senate. Both those bills died in committee. Five bills were introduced in the Pennsylvania House of Representatives. One of them, house bill 644, was subjected to a motion to discharge the committee, so that the bill could be brought to the floor. The motion to discharge the committee was defeated by a vote of 142 to 39.

In 1949, the next session of the Pennsylvania Legislature, four senate bills and four house bills were introduced. None was reported from committee.

A resolution to discharge the senate committee from the further consideration of senate bill 137 was defeated on April 21, 1949, by a vote of 35 to 15.

A resolution to discharge the house committee from the further consideration of house bill 975 was defeated on April 5, 1949, by a vote of 109 to 89.

A resolution to discharge the house committee from the further consideration of house bill 32 was defeated on April 21, 1949, by a vote of 103 to 79.

So, Mr. President and Senators, it must be clearly apparent that in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania for the last three sessions of its legislature, FEPC legislation has been proposed each time, and at least in the second and third session, those in 1947 and 1949, such proposed legislation was rejected by very large votes of both houses of the legislature.

I think it might be enlightening at this time to read the plaintive testimony of a certain witness who, coming here before the house committee in the course of its hearings on house bill 4453, found great fault with the State of Pennsylvania because it had exercised its sovereign pleasure in declining to adopt FEPC legislation, and so testified before the house committee in May 1949. I quote now only two sentences from the testimony of Mr. Will Maslow, counsel for the American Jewish Congress, who testified at some length. In the course of his testimony he said:

> Perhaps there may be some question in your mind as to the necessity for Federal action, in view of the fact that by now we have eight effective State FEPC laws.

Mr. President, that testimony was given in May 1949. This is May 1950. There still are eight FEPC States, but there is no indication that any other States will be added soon to that galaxy.

The witness further said:

> One of the answers to that problem, Mr. Chairman, is that in many States, like Pennsylvania, for example, an FEPC bill has been killed for the third time.

Then the witness proceeded with his testimony.

In other words, it was his philosophy and his position that inasmuch as Pennsylvania had decided in its own good judgment, for the third time in three successive sessions of its legislative body, that it wanted nothing of FEPC legislation, then the thing to do was to come to Washington, and so far as concerns the good citizens and officials of the State of Pennsylvania who had demonstrated their judgment and wisdom so effectively by the treatment they had given to proposed FEPC legislation, make them take, on the Federal level, a law which they did not want and which they have rejected.

Mr. President, how completely juvenile, how completely puerile, how completely hopeless and undemocratic is an approach which says that, "Since we cannot sell the people of a great sovereign Commonwealth on the wisdom or the justice of such legislation, we will run down yonder to Washington and pass a Federal law and then come back and ram it down the throats of the people of that great Commonwealth."

That simply cannot be done in this sort of field; and the sooner we learn from experience that that kind of experimentation in legislation is wrong, and particularly so at a time when unity in our Nation is so imperatively necessary, the better it will be for us and for the rest of the world which looks to us for unity and for leadership.

Mr. President, that is the situation in Pennsylvania. There are many other quotations which I could have given, but I think I have by now presented a reasonably clear picture of what has happened in this field in the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I turn next to the sovereign State of Ohio. The figures which I shall present are the result of the work and research of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Its study shows that the Legislature of Ohio has rejected 10 separate proposals on FEPC legislation during the 1945, 1947, and 1949 sessions of the Ohio Legislature.

The first was in the 1945 session. Senate bill 292, which was designed to set up a commission to make studies and recommendations in the field of discrimination in employment, was rejected.

In the 1947 legislature, five separate bills were introduced. Four of them—senate bills 10 and 90 and house bills 58 and 111—were designed to create an Ohio FEPC. All of them either failed to receive a first reading or were killed in committee.

The fifth bill, senate bill 354, was a study proposal. It was referred to the rules committee, and died in committee after a motion to withdraw it had failed of adoption. That was in 1947.

In 1949 three bills to create an Ohio FEPC law were introduced—senate bill 250 and house bills 32 and 106. The first two died in committee. The last, house bill 106, passed the house by a vote of 70 to 61 and went to the senate. It was amended in the senate committee by striking out all of the enforcement provisions; and in that shape—that is, as a voluntary bill—it passed the senate by a vote of 30 to 1.

Eventually, however, after the bill went to conference and after the conferees on the part of the house insisted on including some enforcement features, the senate by a vote of 17 to 13 rejected the report of the conference committee, thus killing the bill.

In the same 1949 session of the legislature, a joint resolution (S. J. Res. 11)

was proposed to amend the Ohio Constitution so as to permit of State FEPC legislation. That resolution was referred to the senate committee on commerce and labor, and died there.

In the summary which I have there is much more detail upon each of these measures, but I think what I have given is sufficient to show what happened to 10 specific proposals in the Legislature of the State of Ohio during the 1945, 1947, and 1949 sessions of its legislature.

I come next to Illinois. In that great State 18 different FEPC proposals were rejected during the regular biennial sessions of its legislature in 1943, 1945, 1947, and 1949. I read now from the letter of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

> The first such legislation came before both the house and senate (of Illinois) in 1943 in the nature of a house bill (H. B. 494). This 1943 bill to establish the Illinois State Board of Fair Employment Practices was amended in the house committee to which it has been referred and was reported favorably as amended. It passed the house June 17, 1943, by a vote of 86 to 19. From there it went to the senate where it died in the committee on industrial affairs. An attempt to discharge the committee from further consideration of this bill failed by a vote of 18 to 7 and the senate ordered on June 28, 1943, that the bill be left in committee, thus killing it.

In 1945 in the Illinois Legislature four bills were introduced in the senate and one bill in the house, each bill designed to create a State FEPC, and, in addition, two separate appropriation bills were also introduced to finance State FEPC activities.

> No bill creating an FEPC or appropriating money therefor became law. Each of the senate bills was tabled. In the house, however, house bill No. 353 was withdrawn from committee on a discharge motion. By a vote of 77 to 16 the committee was discharged.

The bill then came on, with amendments, and was defeated by a vote of 41 to 28, on June 26, 1945. So ended the 1945 session of the Illinois Legislature.

In 1947, FEPC bills met the same fate as they had in 1943 and 1945. Three FEPC bills were tabled in the Illinois Senate. In addition, the senate refused to consider a resolution placing the senate on record as being in favor of an FEPC, and also tabled a bill authorizing cities and villages to enact local FEPC bills.

Furthermore, in 1947, in the house, two FEPC bills were tabled, one bill being reported with committee recommendations that it do not pass.

> The house also failed to act on a resolution, house resolution No. 19, "pledging the support of the house in the enactment of a law which will guarantee equality of opportunity to all in the obtaining of employment in this State.

Mr. President, could it be clearer that the members of the Illinois Legislature felt that here was a field which had a large appeal, but which nevertheless they felt to be not a field in which legislation could be properly or successfully employed? The legislature did, in 1947, create a good will interracial commission limited to an investigation of means of affording opportunity and profitable employment to all persons and the promotion of tolerance and good will. This commission made quite a study, and in its report in 1948, stated that it felt an FEPC was needed in the State, on the State level; and I quote from its report:

> Impartial review of the various approaches to opportunities for employment herein reported in a direct factual manner, brings out clearly the fundamental fact that discrimination in opportunities for employment on racial, creedal, and ethnic grounds has become a responsibility for the State government.

To carry out that recommendation—

> In 1949 two FEPC bills were introduced (S. B. No. 145 and H. B. No. 163). The senate bill died in committee. The house bill passed the house 81 to 43, but was voted down in the senate, 25 to 23, on June 14, 1949. The bill was thus 3 votes short of the 26 votes required for passage in the Illinois Senate.

So, Mr. President, there is another great State, which for 4 successive sessions of its legislature, has rejected legislation—18 separate proposals, in all—to create a State FEPC agency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the very able and distinguished Senator from Florida yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEELY in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to ask the very able junior Senator from Florida whether he is not perhaps laboring under a misapprehension concerning the nature of the motion which is now before the United States Senate. I rather inferred from the discussion of the distinguished Senator from Florida that he is opposed to a Federal FEPC law. Am I correct in that assumption?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is quite correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And he is directing his argument against the enactment of a Federal FEPC law?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am directing my argument against the enactment of a Federal FEPC law, and, had the Senator been more timely in his arrival, he would have found out the connection, at least in the judgment of the Senator from Florida, between Federal and State legislation. The Senator from Florida quoted specifically from the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], though he could have quoted from many other sources to the same effect, that no advocate of this Federal FEPC legislation views it as sufficient, standing by itself, to deal with this situation, but instead regards it as being supplementary in nature to State legislation, and, as stated by the Senator from Minnesota, to local legislation. Moreover, the bill proposes by its very terms to allow the Federal board to turn over and delegate to the State or to the local agency, in the event one is established by satisfactory law, the enforcement of this legislation in its own jurisdiction. So the Senator from Florida has simply been reviewing the complete lack of success—the complete failure—that has been noted in all the States shown in blue upon the map which is directly back of the Senator, 19 in all, when efforts have been made, and repeated efforts, embracing about 200 proposed State laws, to enact FEPC legislation as a State matter. The Senator from Florida was merely reading from the report of the Library of Congress on what has happened in Illinois.

In order to make the picture more complete, however, the Senator from Florida thinks it would probably be proper at this time to say that the State of Illinois has a living example of what FEPC legislation means, in that the city of Chicago has a city ordinance on this subject, and in that, therefore, the people of Illinois have a chance to see first hand from what happens in that city, whether anything good or anything sufficiently acceptable comes out of it, as a result of which they would want to have it in their State law.

Apparently the people of Illinois, through their representatives, both in the upper house and in the lower house of the Illinois legislature, have been deciding in the sessions of 1943, 1945, 1947, and 1949, some of which time was before the setting up of the Chicago experiment, some of which was after it, that there was nothing in the Chicago experiment which made them desire to adopt it as a State measure. At least, they had declined to do so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask a third question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to respond.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the Senator was addressing himself to the question whether we should have a Federal FEPC law, but I am sure the Senator will pardon me if I say that that is not the question which is now before the United States Senate. The question which is actually before the United States Senate is whether the Senate will proceed to consider an FEPC law. It seemed to me that the very able Senator from Florida was not addressing himself to that issue. Now, I should like to ask my good friend——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to respond to that part of the admonition of my good friend, the junior Senator from Illinois, by saying that it became entirely necessary to discuss some of the facts in connection with this long-drawn-out but generally unsuccessful effort in States other than the States of the South to adopt FEPC legislation, because unfortunately the Senate committee, entrusted with the duty of holding hearings on this particular measure—and the junior Senator from Illinois is one of the outstanding members of that committee—saw fit to have no hearings whatever, turned down requests by brother Senators to appear for the purpose of a hearing, and afforded no opportunity for a hearing to the legislators of the good State of Illinois and 18 other States, which had declined to adopt FEPC legislation, since the last hearing was held in the Eightieth Congress. The committee declined to allow to appear before it legislators, members of industries who were affected, members of labor unions who felt that they were exceedingly adversely affected by the pro-

posals of such a bill, and members of the general public.

So the Senator from Florida, speaking only for himself, felt it might be appropriate, or at least that he had the right to decide it was appropriate, for him to discuss briefly on the floor of the Senate the complete collapse in the State of Illinois of the oft-repeated effort of the good citizens of that State who, no doubt, were animated by the highest motives and objectives, though mistakenly, in the opinion of the Senator from Florida, in endeavoring to enact State FEPC legislation during the past 7 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very grateful to the Senator for the very careful study he has made of the varying degrees of progress of this legislation in various State legislatures. But would it be permissible to ask him if he objects to the Senate even considering the motion? Why should we not have an opportunity to consider the motion and then to debate the bill? In my judgment, the Senator from Florida, with the fairness which has always characterized him in this body, should at least vote to consider the bill because I am sure the Senator wants the Senate to debate the question.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the kindness and the candor of the Senator from Illinois, but the Senator from Illinois, with other members of the committee, has created a condition in which action is sought without the benefit of any hearing whatsoever; nor was any report forthcoming from any members of the committee until May 5, the same day on which the motion was made to take up the bill. On that day a report was filed, whereas the bill had been on the calendar since October 17, 1949. That being the case, the Senator from Florida feels that he certainly does not have the wisdom to provide by his feeble efforts and his brief remarks a substitute for a careful taking of testimony and a careful making of recommendations based upon testimony, and he feels that the Senator from Chicago——

Mr. DOUGLAS. I represent the State of Illinois, as well as the city of Chicago. I am very proud to claim Chicago as my home, but I do not represent that city exclusively.

Mr. HOLLAND. That, perhaps, is correct, but I remember that the Senator from Chicago during the consideration of rent-control last year made it very clear that he felt he had a peculiar trust upon his mind, heart, and soul, because the people of the State, outside Chicago, had treated his people unkindly, so he thought. Therefore, he prevailed successfully upon the Senator from Florida, and a majority of the Senate was willing to decide that he was a stalwart fighter for the people of Chicago, and that, although other persons in the State of Illinois had turned his good city down, we would come to his aid and comfort, which we did, and I believe the Senator was very grateful.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I so expressed myself at the time, and I want again to say that our good friends from the South, in the matter of rent control on apartments in large cities, were exceedingly courteous and friendly and received my undying gratitude. But it so happens that we are now considering a motion to take up an FEPC bill. We are presumably not discussing the bill but are merely considering a motion to consider the bill. I inferred, from what my very able friend from Florida has said, that if the Senate Committee on Education and Labor had held hearings, he would vote to consider the motion——

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator has gone a little further than the Senator from Florida intended to go.

The Senator from Florida has made his attitude clear that he feels the Senate would be exceedingly unwise and unfaithful to its trust and derelict in its obligations to the Nation as a whole, and particularly to the people of 19 States, including the State of Illinois, which turned down FEPC, if it permitted such proposed legislation to come up without the benefit of any hearings, without the benefit of any recommendations, without the benefit of anything whatever except the views and philosophies of various members of the committee. I have not been able to agree with all of them, but they were ably expressed. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois and other members of the committee for remembering enough about the measure to be able, some 8 months after it was reported, to file a report for the edification of the Members of the Senate who, at last, were to be given a chance to say why they felt, as the junior Senator from Florida feels, that it is an imposition to ask the Senate to take up a bill on which the committee failed to hold hearings, failed to produce a printed record, failed to show anything which happened during the years since the last record was made, and what happened in the State of Illinois which the Senator so ably represents. The Senator from Florida feels it would be a hopeless mistake to permit the complete defeat of the rules of parliamentary procedure by allowing such an important proposal to come up without the committee having in any sense discharged its duty or fulfilled its trust, which is the case in connection with this matter.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask one simple question. In view of the fact that the committee held no hearings, made no study of the proposed legislation, but simply refused, by a tie vote, to hold any hearings or make any study, and reported the measure without hearings, why should Senators consider the views of the Members of the committee as being any more informed than are those of any other Senator?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has a splendid question, and I am glad he asked it. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to accord great wisdom and dignity to the members of the committee, and I subscribe to the belief that it is the duty of the membership of a committee to take patient, diligent, and wise action, based in the traditions of this body, going back to the founding of the Nation, which action is necessary, if we are to have sound legislation; but the Senator from Florida would say to the Senator from Louisiana that he has not been impressed with the feeling and has been unable to come to the conclusion that the distinguished Senator from Illinois and some of his colleagues and conferees have wanted to have presented on the floor of the Senate, or wanted to make available to the Members of the Senate, to the press, and to the Nation, the very disappointing experience which advocates of FEPC legislation have had in recent years when they have taken the question closer to the State legislatures which are very close to the people and when they have been refused so consistently, as happened in the State of the good Senator from Illinois in 1943, 1945, 1947, and 1949. I think the Senate would be interested in knowing about it.

Mr. LONG. Much as we admire the very learned and able junior Senator from Illinois, we must also have some respect for the legislature of his State.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his suggestion. I feel that the Senator from Florida, who appears rarely on the floor, and never to the extent of taking 3 days of the time of the Senate, as did the Senator from Illinois during his able and learned discussion on the late bill referred to as the Kerr bill, might have a couple hours of the Senate's time in which to discuss at least his views on why he feels the committee has done the Senate wrong. He sticks by those views, and he does not believe the Senator from Illinois or any other able member of the committee can justify the action, or the lack of action, resulting in the complete abuse of parliamentary processes and procedure which characterized the committee's mishandling of this particularly important bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Florida is perhaps aware of the fact that in 1947 a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of this body held prolonged hearings on FEPC, which are contained in a light-blue colored document near the desk of the Senator from Florida, consisting of 810 pages, in which the arguments on both sides were exhaustively advanced, and that, furthermore, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, the House Committee on Education and Labor held prolonged hearings on the subject, which ran to 577 pages. I take it, therefore, that the subject has been thoroughly discussed in committee meetings. We know perfectly well, as reasonable and practical men, that probably the opinions of the Senators from south of the Mason and Dixon's line would not have been altered by additional hearings. No new facts would have been brought out. Why is it not enough to take the two sets of hearings and say that there has been sufficient prior discussion to justify the Senate in at least considering the bill?

That is all we are seeking at this moment. All we are seeking is the right to

have the Senate consider the bill. I know that my friend from Florida is a fair-minded man.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for that conclusion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, I find it difficult to believe that a fair-minded man would oppose the consideration of the subject. I can understand that opinions may differ once the issue reaches the floor of the Senate. However, I have been reading the RECORD for some time now, and in all the speeches which have been made by Senators who are apparently opposed to FEPC, 99 percent of the emphasis has been on FEPC legislation. I submit that is not the issue before us. The issue before us is whether we should proceed to the consideration of the FEPC bill. I think on that point fair-minded men will agree that the Senate should be permitted to consider the measure and to come to a vote.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator for his question. In reply I would say simply that the Senator from Chicago has been——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Pardon me. I am still the Senator from Illinois, although I am happy also to represent the city of Chicago.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let us say the Senator from Chicago, Ill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the State of Illinois.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator has been a little too early in making his concession to the fair-mindedness of the junior Senator from Florida, because the junior Senator from Florida believes there is no way for the Senator from Illinois to evade the conclusion which Members of the Senate and millions of American people have drawn, to the effect that the Senator from Illinois, in keeping and in company with other good Senators who comprise the majority of the committee of which he is a member, simply failed to observe the clear mandates and requirements of parliamentary procedure. Instead, he proposes to take the record made in 1947 and in 1948.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have here the record of the hearings conducted in 1945, in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have two pounds of hearings before us.

Mr. HOLLAND. That takes us even further back into history. That was before the cessation of the Second World War. The Senator from Illinois forgets the point made by the Senator from Florida, which I think should not be forgotten. The point I make is that there has been developed an experience of 2 years under State FEPC laws. There have been 2 years of experience in States which have adopted FEPC laws. There has been experience developed also in a great many more States where efforts were made to pass FEPC laws, most of which attempts were abysmally unsuccessful. The Senator from Florida wonders why it was the people of Illinois declined to yield to the seductive efforts of the Senator from Chicago, Ill., and his friends in presenting something that had been good in Chicago but was not regarded as good in the rest of the State. It was regarded so far from good that they knocked it down. The Senator from Florida would like to have known authoritatively why that was the case. He would like to have had the benefit of evidence given by leaders on both sides of the question. He would like to have given leaders on both sides of the question an opportunity to be heard by the committee and to express their convictions. They doubtless had reached conclusions. However, the able Senator from Chicago, Ill., was not willing to have those convictions expressed to a committee of the Senate. I cannot ascribe any reason for his decision. Apparently he did not want people from his own legislature, and people from the legislatures of 18 other States who had declined to adopt FEPC legislation, to give their thinking to the Senate of the United States through the medium of committee hearings. Instead, the Senator prefers to depend on hearings held in 1947, in 1945, and, I believe he said, the hearings——

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the 1949 hearings before the House committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I know that the Senator is too diligent to have anyone think he is trying to get by with a consideration of the House committee's hearings. I am sure he would not want people to think that he is willing to have someone else do his work. He is a very diligent Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois testified before the House committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the Senator from Illinois would not want to be regarded as being willing to accept the conclusion or judgment of a committee of our sister legislative body based on the testimony of any given witness which required exploration and explanation when the witness was on the stand.

Mr. RUSSELL and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from Florida if the argument as made by the able Senator from Illinois were carried to its logical conclusion it would not be just as reasonable to say, because we held hearings on a tax bill to fight World War I, we should not hold hearings on another revolutionary tax bill to finance the carrying on of World War II? This bill is entirely different from a bill on which hearings were held in 1947. As a result of those hearings and the subsequent debate on the Senate floor, a number of improvements were made in the bill.

I regret to hear the distinguished Senator from Illinois make the argument that because hearings were held by a committee of the House the Senate should not conduct any hearings. It is the very essence of our Government to have balances between the House and Senate. The committees of both Houses are supposed to pass upon legislation, because in that way one can correct the errors of the other. In that way one House can explore angles which had not come to the attention of the other body. If we were to adopt the philosophy that because the House has held hearings the Senate should not conduct hearings, we would be relegating the Senate to an inferior position in our legislative system. We are resisting the motion to take up this bill because it comes to us without any hearings, because the committee could not get together even to formulate a set of recommendations. Indeed, no report was filed on the bill until very recently. Regardless of the pressures which are involved, it would be a sad day if we were to be whipped into abandoning the system of hearings by a committee, the servant of the Senate, which is supposed to discharge that function. If we are to be denied the right as Senators to present amendments to a committee and go before it to present our view why a certain amendment should be adopted, and if we are to be stampeded into taking up this bill, I should like to know what answer we would make to another pressure group which might come to us with another bill and say, "You rushed through the FEPC bill, which was a political bill, without hearings and without receiving any recommendations from a committee, and therefore you should do the same for us, because we have 5 percent more voters than the supporters of the FEPC bill had." It would be disastrous to our parliamentary system. It would jeopardize the rights of the American people. It would deny the right of petition. It would take from an American citizen the right to come before a committee of the Senate to present his case.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia. He is eminently correct.

I invite the attention of our colleague from Illinois to the fact that even the House did not seem to be too favorably impressed with the recommendation of the House committee, because the House tore the bill to shreds and substituted its own bill, and sent over to the Senate a voluntary measure. The Senator from Illinois and his confreres are not trying to bring up the voluntary measure which was the final expression of wisdom on the part of our coordinate body. Instead, they are trying to go back to where the House committee was, even though that committee has been repudiated by the membership of the House which the committee served.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Earlier in the colloquy with the distinguished junior Senator from Florida he asked a question which at the moment was rhetorical but about which I thought he wanted some information. He said that he would like to have the junior Senator from Illinois explain why it was that the Illinois Legislature at its last session did not pass an FEPC law. May I inquire whether he still wants an answer to that question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I decline to yield except for a question. The

Senator from Illinois will have his own time to discuss this measure, and I shall be happy to listen to him at that time, and shall be happy to listen to a question now, if he has one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was I correct in inferring that the Senator from Florida said that the lower house of the Illinois Legislature passed an FEPC law in 1949 by a vote of 81 to 43?

Mr. HOLLAND. I read from the report of the Library of Congress, and shall repeat, if the Senator will permit me to go back to it. What year was that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Nineteen forty-nine.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have the records here for 1943, 1945, 1947, and 1949. This is a quotation from the report of the Library of Congress, and I shall read the entire paragraph relating to 1949:

> In 1949 two FEPC bills were introduced (S. B. 145 and H. B. 163). The senate bill died in committee. The house bill passed the house 81 to 43——

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was my point, that there was a vote in its favor of 81 to 43, or almost 2 to 1, in the house.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senater would mind suspending until I try to comply with his reasonable request. I shall continue the quotation—

> but was voted down in the senate, 25 to 23, on June 14, 1949. The bill was thus 3 votes short of the 26 votes required for passage in the Illinois Senate.

I think I have read verbatim from the report of the Library of Congress.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the members of the House of Representatives of Illinois are elected every 2 years, and therefore those who voted in 1949 had just been elected in 1948, whereas the members of the senate are elected for a 4-year term, and only half of those who voted in 1949 had been elected in 1948 and the other half had been elected in 1946? Is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator was not aware of it but is not surprised to learn of it. That is precisely the structure of the senate in his own State, the State of Florida, and in many other States with which he is familiar.

The Senator may continue by saying that he is not surprised that in the 1948 election that type of thought and philosophy may have prevailed, because the Senator from Illinois has made it so abundantly clear, during his all-too-brief stay here, that that is his philosophy, and I understood he was one of the leaders of the ticket, that he ran a magnificent race, made a tremendous impression upon his people, and he carried along to success numerous others who were candidates of his party at that time. Therefore, it is not surprising to learn that the House of Representatives of Illinois might have voted in the way indicated. But the senate—the more conservative body, the body which has its feet on the ground generally a little more sturdily, because of the very fact that it does not have to respond every 2 years to the electorate, and therefore has a little sounder perspective of things that are suggested—the senate apparently did not join in that philosophy. Let us hope that they will continue to exercise the good judgment, along the same line, which they demonstrated so ably in 1949.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Florida aware of the fact that the overwhelming proportion of the State senators who had been elected to the Illinois Legislature in 1948 voted for a State FEPC law and that the overwhelming proportion of the senators who had been elected in 1946, 2 years before, voted against an FEPC law, and that, therefore, it can be said the FEPC law was defeated in the senate by the dead hand of the 1946 election? Is the Senator aware of that fact?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is not aware of that fact. That is one of the facts which he would have liked to see the people of Illinois have a chance to bring out in the committee room, as they might have done, if their desire to be heard had not been thwarted by the apparent resistance of the Senator from Illinois to conducting any hearings. If that could have been shown to be the case in Illinois and in the other 18 of the 19 States affected, I am sure it would have made a profound impression on the members of the committee. They might have found material there which would have justified them in making a different sort of report, or at least making mention of that fact to the Senate. The Senate is forced to accept such gleanings, in its effort to get facts, as may come from the Senator from Illinois or others in minor expressions which come out in the debate.

It would appear to me that the determined attack on the motion to take up the bill is being justified by the fact that the Senator from Illinois has presented some facts which have not heretofore been made known to the Senate. I wish the same situation might obtain in regard to the other States, but unfortunately other Senators are not here to take that position, and unfortunately the Senator from Illinois by his own decision has aided in thwarting the opportunity of other Members of the Senate, who are not members of the committee, from having the benefit of the expression and experience of people in the 19 States which have rejected FEPC laws.

On that one ground alone the Senator from Florida thinks that the Senator from Illinois erred very greatly. He is not chastising the Senator from Illinois, he has no right to do that, but he feels he does have the right to advance his views in support of his feeling that it is untimely to take up this bill and it would be unwise to take it up, because the Senator from Illinois and his compatriots on the committee have, by their determined opposition to the granting of any right of hearing, defeated the purpose for which their committee and other committees exist, and have deprived other Members of the Senate of the opportunity to have the expressions that would develop from such a hearing.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. I should like to ask the Senator if he has noted section 9 (e) of the bill we are being asked to take up. That section appears to be unprecedented. I ask him if he does not agree that this is a section unheard of in American jurisprudence? Here is a section which denies individuals the right to refuse to testify on the ground that what they might say might incriminate them. Here is a section which, so far as I know, without any study or analysis we are asked to pass upon, compelling people to testify and to say they committed crimes, to give evidence under oath, and even though that testimony cannot be used against them, it can be used against their relatives and neighbors. Does not the Senator feel that if the committee had studied this language, certainly Senators who voted to report the bill favorably would think we should not compel individuals to forego their rights to refuse to testify on the ground that they might incriminate themselves?

Mr. HOLLAND. Answering the Senator's first suggestion, Senators did not vote to report the bill favorably, but they reported it without recommendation. Senators on the floor do not even have the benefit of the individual judgment of Senators, except as it is expressed in individual opinions or the majority opinion at the time the report was printed, at the time the debate started.

In regard to the second matter, there have been a few isolated instances in recent years in which such philosophy has been written into legislation. The Senator from Florida is not ready to accede at all to the position that such legislation is sound or is American. He has never knowingly voted for any such legislation. He agrees entirely with the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana that that kind of legislation is hopelessly un-American, and has no place on the American statute books, and he will oppose it with all his vigor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a good deal of sympathy with the contention of the Senator from Florida that, other things being equal, it would have been highly desirable for the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to have had hearings on the bill. But is it not a fact that the advocates of FEPC have been somewhat discouraged by the procedure which a great many of our friends from the South have adopted once bills of this character have reached the floor of the Senate?

The Senator will doubtless recall the experience of 1946. Neither he nor I were at that time Members of this body, but I happened to be in the hospital at the time and therefore had leisure to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD each morning. I remember, as the Senator from Florida doubtless remembers, that after the Senate Committee on Education and Labor held rather thorough hearings in March 1945—which I hold in my hand, and which total 189 printed pages—the bill was reported to the Senate. A motion was made to bring it up for consideration, and at that time a great many of our southern friends prevented it from

being considered upon the ground, as I believe they declared, that the prayer of the Chaplain the preceding morning had not made a proper reference to the Deity. For some time the entire proceeding was stymied by speeches, which seemed to me extraordinary at the time, in which it was set forth that the Chaplain had not given proper recognition to the Deity in the prayer of the given morning.

Now I should like to ask my good friend from Florida this question: Will the good friends from south of the Mason and Dixon's line agree that in the future they will allow important measures to be at least considered, provided hearings are held on such bills? While I have no authority to speak for my senior colleague, the majority leader, if such a pledge could be given it might be possible either now or in the future to have hearings held, and then if it could be agreed that the holding of the hearings and the presentation of the report would insure the support of the able Senator from Florida and his colleagues, who feel as he does about this matter, I think a great many of our difficulties would be removed, and we could at least proceed to discuss these issues on the floor of the Senate as well as in the committee.

The experience of 1946 really inflicted a shock upon the nervous systems of those of us who were advocates of FEPC, because we felt that no matter how carefully the testimony was taken we would not be permitted to consider it because certain methods which were used to prevent its coming up then were frivolous. I read that prayer of the Chaplain, and it seemed to me a perfectly proper prayer. I do not know whether he was a Unitarian, a Theosophist, a member of an Ethical Culture society, a Baptist, a Methodist, or an Episcopalian, but to me it seemed to be a perfectly proper prayer. But immediately some Senator rose and objected to the approval of the Journal because the prayer itself had not made proper reference to God.

With all due deference to our friends from the South, that seemed to us a very frivolous ground for objection. We inferred that it was not the real ground for objection; that the real ground was not the prayer of the Chaplain, but the determination of our friends from the South to prevent this matter from even being considered.

Mr. President, we live in a democracy. The South already has ample protection in its representation in the Senate. The rules of the Senate give them ample protection when matters are up for a final decision and a vote. Why should this additional obstacle be thrown in the way of free discussion, namely opposition to the consideration of a measure? And the motion to consider, I should like to submit to my good friend from Florida, is the only matter which at this moment is before the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL rose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may reply to my good friend the Senator from Illinois before yielding to the Senator from Georgia, I will say that in the first place I thought the Senator from Illinois was pleading with the Senator from Florida a few minutes ago not to be governed by the dead hand of the past, or something of that sort. I believe that was the substance of his remark; that he did not want to be governed by something that happened in 1946. If I have correctly understood—and I may have misunderstood—this represents the present suggestion of the Senator from Illinois: He wants to go back to a period prior to the time when he was in the Senate, and on the basis of report, rumor and information that had come to him prior to the time the Senator from Florida was a Member of the Senate, to bring something out and discuss it as if it were mandatorily binding upon the Senator from Florida or the Senator from Illinois. I think it is not at all binding.

I may say further before yielding to the Senator from Georgia, who has sought recognition for a question, that while I have some sympathy with the Senator from Illinois in his feeling that at least the prayer should not have been questioned seriously, I hope that no profound objection was made to the contents.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think a profound objection was made to it, but certainly a prolonged objection was made to it.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator from Illinois will permit me to conclude. I wish to say I am a little surprised that the Senator now proposes to substitute himself for the Chaplain by himself trying to put the Senator from Florida in the position of having to take a pledge which will be binding in the future life of the two Senators in this body, which I hope will be a long and pleasant one. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned he is going to judge each issue on its own merits. He is going to retain to himself the power and prerogative of making his own decisions as to whether or not he thinks legislation has been adequately prepared, or whether, if it has been adequately prepared, the issue is so vital, so tremendous in its importance, that everything that is done to consider it and bring it to passage should be objected to and fought by the Senator from Florida and any other Senator who shares his convictions.

So the Senator from Florida, though always pleased to hear the comments and the suggestions of the Senator from Illinois, cannot agree with him on either of his counts; first, that either of us is bound by the dead hand of the past, or, second, that either of us should attempt to prejudge the issues which may arise in the future. The Senator from Florida, at least for himself, will not attempt to prejudge them, but will for himself decide those issues as they arise and as he thinks their importance requires him to decide them.

I now yield to the Senator from Georgia for a question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I would not undertake on any ordinary occasion to dispute a question of fact with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, whose mind is a veritable storehouse of knowledge. It so happens that I was present in the Senate in 1946, and I can say that the Senator from Illinois has his facts all in error when he charges that there was any objection to the prayer of the Chaplain of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will indulge me for a moment, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for a comment by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, not a question, without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I will have no objection if the Senator from Georgia will speak a little louder so we on this side of the aisle can hear him.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am merely correcting the RECORD. The Senator from Illinois had stated that there was objection made to the prayer of the Chaplain in 1946 because he did not mention in it the name of the Deity. I wish to say the Senator from Illinois is entirely in error in this statement. The prayer was delivered by the revered present Chaplain of the Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, one of the great divines of this era, and naturally did not omit mention of the Deity. The objection lodged was against the unanimous-consent request to dispense with the reading of the Journal. Objection was made because a motion had been made to take up the bill on a day on which that motion was not subject, under the rules, to debate. The motion was made in violation of what we considered as an understanding that no motion would be made to proceed to the consideration of any bill until after the President's message had been received. We therefore availed ourselves of the technicality of requiring that the Journal of the Senate be read. Upon the reading of the Journal it appeared that it did not contain the prayer of the Chaplain. Therefore the late lamented Senator John H. Overton, I believe it was, moved to amend the Journal of the Senate in order that the Chaplain's prayer, which did contain reference to the Deity, might appear in the Journal. I do not know that he gave this reason for it at the time, but some of us felt, at least in our hearts, that if there ever was a time when the Chaplain's prayer should be stressed and should appear in the Journal of the Senate it was then, in 1946, in the face of the irregular proceeding to bring up the FEPC.

And, Mr. President, if there ever since has been so great a need for prayer for the Senate of the United States and for the country it is now, when it is sought to bring up the FEPC bill without any hearings and without any recommendations. I can see stronger and additional and sounder reason for the Chaplain praying for the Senate and the country now than in 1946, because in 1946 the committee at least had held some hearings on the bill and had made recommendations, whereas in 1950 there have been no hearings on the bill and no recommendations by the committee. We are now confronted with a naked bill which has had no more consideration than if it had been introduced on the

day the motion was made to proceed to its consideration.

No objection was made to the Chaplain's prayer. On the contrary, we were insisting that it be set forth in the Journal.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his observation.

Mr. President, I had intended to conclude before this time; but, as the Presiding Officer will note, there have been a good many interruptions, for which I have been glad to yield, of course.

The next case I wish to mention in connection with State legislation and State experience in the FEPC field or in the effort to have the States adopt State FEPC legislation is that of California.

I have already mentioned the referendum to the people of California, which was decided by such an overwhelming adverse vote by the people of California themselves in 1946, the vote being better than two and one-half to one, with approximately 2,250,000 votes cast, and with every county of the State showing a substantial majority, so I am informed, against the approval of the FEPC proposal.

However, the things I shall take up at this time are those having to do with attempts to have such legislation enacted in the great State of California. This comment will be based upon a rather lengthy monograph or letter written by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The entire monograph is available to any Senator who wishes to see it.

California's Legislature rejected the first FEPC bill introduced in that body on June 16, 1945. That was the date of rejection. The bill itself was introduced in the California Assembly on January 3, 1945. When the matter came up for vote, under the provisions of the California Constitution 60 favorable votes in the Assembly were required for the bill to be considered, but not that many votes could be mustered. Only 46 votes could be obtained in favor of its consideration, so the bill failed even to come up for consideration.

Following that occurrence in June 1945—and I quote now from the monograph of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

> The press of California reported that considerable pressure was being brought to bear on Governor Warren by minority groups to press for a California FEPC. In his proclamation convening an extraordinary session of the legislature on January 7, 1946, Governor Warren stated 53 purposes to be accomplished at this extra session. Purpose No. 14 was:
>
> "To consider and act upon legislation to provide for the prevention and elimination of practices of discrimination in employment—

And so forth. I shall not read the full text.

I read further from the letter from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

> As a result, an FEPC bill was introduced in the assembly the next day, January 8, 1946. That bill was reported from committee without recommendation and no action was ever taken on it. * * *
>
> Subsequently petitions began circulating to place on the November 1946 ballot an initiated measure—

Which I have mentioned previously in my remarks; and it was rejected so overwhelmingly by the voters of California in the election of November 1946.

I now read further from the letter of the Legislative Reference Service:

> The measure was defeated November 5, 1946, by over a million votes, totals being—for the measure, 675,697; against the measure, 1,682,646.
>
> It was in 1947, however, that the movement to sponsor an FEPC in California was given the final and fatal blow.

Mr. President, I am still quoting from the letter of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I continue to quote from it:

> One bill (S. B. No. 16) had been introduced in the senate and one bill (A. B. 2211) had been introduced in the assembly.
>
> Neither bill got further than being reported, for on March 24, 1947, a Joint Fact-Finding Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities in California reported that the proposed FEPC was Communist-inspired.

I wish to have the Senate note that point clearly, namely, that a joint fact-finding committee of the California Legislature, appointed to investigate this and other similar matters having to do with un-American activities, reported, during the pendency of those two bills, which were introduced in 1947, that—and I quote again from the letter of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress:

> A Joint Fact-Finding Legislative Committee on Un-American Activities in California reported that the proposed FEPC was Communist-inspired. Committee investigators reported that after an exhaustive study they found that more than one-half of the 63 sponsors identified with FEPC in California "had been prominent in movements sponsored by the Communists and left-wingers in California." The committee in its summary of findings stated—

Mr. President, there are two pages of the findings of the committee. Rather than weary the Senate by reading them, I ask unanimous consent at this time that the quotations from the committee report, as they appear in the letter from the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The committee in its summary of findings stated:
>
> "The Communist Party infiltrates every conceivable mass organization in the country—'in trade unions, in farm organizations, in ladies' clubs, in Harlem, in the deep South, among the intellectuals.' It inspires the creation of mass organizations, to which non-Communists are attracted because of publicized purported 'liberal' objectives. This Communist work is everywhere efficiently centralized, correlated, directed and organized." (Assembly Journal, 1947, Report at p. 1629, and pp. 46 and 17 ff.)
>
> The committee, terming its findings "Behind the FEPC," reported:
>
> "BEHIND THE FEPC
>
> "Early in 1945 it became apparent to the Communist Party leaders in California that a political organization capable of drawing ethnical groups into its sphere of influence was necessary to supplement the work of its other fronts. The Communist inspired Fair Employment Practices Act (FEPC) was to be launched as a rallying point for racial minorities and the Communist Party hoped to mobilize these groups at the polls in the 1946 elections and thus carry their own candidates with an overwhelming vote for the initiative measure.
>
> "Committee investigators made an exhaustive study of the tracts, pamphlets, dodgers, handbills, and miscellaneous literature issued by the Southern California Committee for the Promotion of the Fair Employment Practices Act (FEPC), generally referred to in the 1946 elections as proposition No. 11. The committee learned that of the 63 sponsors and officers of the committee for proposition No. 11 more than one-half had been prominent in movements sponsored by the Communists and left-wingers in California.
>
> "Augustus F. Hawkins, assemblyman from the sixty-second assembly district in Los Angeles County, was listed as the executive director of the committee.
>
> "Hawkins has consistently followed the Communist Party line. In 1943 he endorsed a drive for funds for the west coast organ of the Communist Party, the People's Daily World. In 1942 he publicly urged the release of Earl Browder, then national secretary of the Communist Party in the United States. (Browder, at that time, was serving a 4-year sentence in a Federal penitentiary.) Hawkins is one of a handful of assemblymen in the California Legislature who has consistently voted against this committee investigating un-American activities in the State. In 1943 he succeeded Oscar Fuss, former functionary in the Communist-dominated Workers' Alliance as legislative director for the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Since this appointment Hawkins has been active in the CIO Political Action Committee. His name has been linked with American Youth for Democracy, formerly the Young Communist League, the People's Educational Center, the California Labor School, and other organizations notoriously known as Communist fronts.
>
> "Dolph Winebrenner was listed as the publicity director of the Southern California Committee for Proposition No. 11. Rena M. Vale (see the committee's 1943 report), a former member of the Communist Party and a witness before this committee, declared under oath that Winebrenner was a member of the professional section of the political commission of the Communist Party in the spring of 1938 and that she served with him on that commission.
>
> "As might be expected, the notorious Marxist, John Howard Lawson, is prominently listed as one of the sponsors of the FEPC proposition. The committee has had occasion to list the Communist activities of Lawson many times and the reader is referred to the committee's 1943 and 1945 reports, as well as the index of this report, for details. While John Howard Lawson is presently eking out a miserable proletarian existence as a screen writer at a fabulous salary in Hollywood, it must be remembered that he was formerly an associate editor of the official organ of the Communist Party of the United States, the New York Daily Worker.
>
> "Among other sponsors of the proposition, taken at random, are such well known party-liners as Fay Allen, Charlotta Bass, Rev. Clayton Russell, Reuben Borough, Carey McWilliams, Leo Gallagher, Samuel Ornitz, and Albert Maltz. Fay Allen, Charlotta Bass, and the Reverend Russell enthusiastically

sponsored and endorsed a call for a fund-drive for the official voice of the Communist Party on the west coast, the People's Daily World, July 9, 1943. Submission to Moscow is chronic with these individuals.

"Carey McWilliams is particularly distinguished by both the congressional and California legislative committees as an individual belonging to an outstanding number of satellites in Stalin's solar system. The reader is referred to the committee's 1943 and 1945 reports for further details on Carey McWilliams. (Also see index this report.)

"Leo Gallagher's Communist record in California is known to nearly every person who has had occasion to interest himself in public affairs. As in the case of Carey McWilliams and John Howard Lawson, the activities of Leo Gallagher are set forth in great detail in the pages of the reports heretofore submitted to the California Legislature. Gallagher is presently a member of the law firm of Katz, Gallagher and Margolis. Both Ben Margolis and Charles Katz, of the said law firm, have been active for many years in Communist Party activities in this State.

"Albert Maltz, Communist dialectic writer, has been used for a number of years for Communist Party 'window-dressing.' He recently caused a furore in Communist Party journalistic circles by daring to state that a novel might be written outside of the Stalinist intellectual straightjacket. Although the incident might have been concocted for ideological agitation for the benefit of backsliding Marxist hack-writers, the 'Maltz sin' was good for many issues in the Communist Party press. Such Kremlin stalwarts as John Howard Lawson and Samuel Sillen vigorously beat Maltz to his knees and after considerable fan-fare at the Embassy Auditorium in Los Angeles, Maltz recanted and now declares with Lawson and Sillen that 'art is a weapon.'

"Those who have read the committee's previous reports will have little difficulty in determining the character and purpose of the so-called Fair Employment Practices Act. The Communist Party had inspired it and the Communist Party was determined to find arguments, whether they existed or not, in support of the proposition. The Communist steering committee had to find terrorizing incidents in order to mobilize racial minorities into a frenzied stampede at the polls in November of 1946. If the needed incidents in question were not in existence, the Communist Party was prepared to manufacture them.

"It should be unnecessary to add that the proposition was deliberately designed to create racial frictions and agitations, rather than to remedy such discriminations between ethnical groups as actually existed" (ibid., pp. 46–48).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, let me read the concluding paragraphs of the letter from the Legislative Reference Service:

In 1949 the California Senate refused to adopt a resolution (S. Res. No. 49) which would have created a senate committee to study discriminatory practices in employment, and to study operation of the New York FEPC.

I wish that all Senators would note that point. In other words, so thoroughly had the public of California become convinced that FEPC was—as it is—Communist-inspired, that even a simple little resolution which would have created a California Senate committee to study discriminatory practices in employment and to study the operation of the New York FEPC Act was turned down and rejected by the California Senate.

The concluding paragraph of the letter from the Legislative Reference Service in reference to the action of the California Assembly in 1949 reads as follows:

The assembly killed an FEPC bill by refusing to force its withdrawal from committee, 35–31.

That completes the letter regarding the legislative occurrences in California in the case of this important matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, so that I may make a brief statement about an important matter relative to the pending question, but without causing the Senator from Florida to lose his right to the floor?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the majority leader for that purpose without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF FILING OF CLOTURE PETITION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on Friday last, before the Senate took a recess until yesterday, I advised all of the Members of the Senate that probably on tomorrow a cloture petition would be presented under rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, to bring to a close the debate upon the motion which is pending before the Senate. On two or three different occasions—and the RECORD will show that I am correct in the statement I am about to make—I have advised the Members of the Senate who were vitally interested in this measure that they should be present in the Senate of the United States ready to vote upon a petition for cloture, to bring the debate to a close upon the motion to take up the bill, either Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday. I think I made that statement early in the debate, and I made another statement last Friday.

I merely make this statement now to advise Members of the Senate that this is an important petition which we are about to present. As everyone knows, under rule XXII, it is necessary for those seeking to bring the debate to a close to obtain 64 votes at the proper time. So every Senator—and I think I can say this regardless of whether he is a Democrat or a Republican—who believes that the debate on the motion should be brought to a close, is from now on acting on his own responsibility as to whether he is here on Friday next; because, tomorrow the petition for cloture will be presented, and, under the rules of the Senate, we will automatically vote on it at 1 o'clock on Friday.

Mr. President, I make this statement in the utmost good faith. I am now again advising Senators, especially Senators on this side of the aisle, who are interested in going along with the position of the majority leader, that those who do not vote on Friday next must take their own responsibility for failure to be present; and I undertake to say that there is no committee assignment, there is no speech to be made on the hustings anywhere that will excuse Senators from attendance at that time. In other words, unless an individual Senator is confined to a hospital or to his home because of illness, he ought to be here on Friday next, of all times.

I have heard the suggestions made that if we wait until Tuesday next, or if we present the petition today, more Senators will be present on Thursday of this week than there will be on Friday, and, if we present the petition on Friday, more Senators will be present on Tuesday than there will be on Friday. It is the same old story, Mr. President, which I have heard ever since I have been in the Senate. Frequently we have tried to accommodate Senators on both sides of the aisle who cannot be here at a certain time, and postponed a vote until another date; but I undertake to say the RECORD will show that the Senator from Illinois has repeatedly advised Senators that we would vote upon a cloture petition some time this week. So plenty of notice has been given, and there is absolutely no excuse in my opinion for a Senator, either upon this side of the aisle, or upon the other side, who is vitally interested in this FEPC measure, not being present on Friday.

I have before me a petition, at the present time, signed by 20 Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. If that petition be presented at this time, the vote on cloture will be had on Thursday.

Mr. LUCAS. I understand. I am not going to present it now.

Mr. RUSSELL. A moment ago the Senator spoke of presenting it.

Mr. LUCAS. If I did, I did not so intend. But I am going to present it tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Illinois to say that he purposed to present the petition tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, does the Chair understand that the discussion now taking place, and any that may ensue on this point, will all be subject to the unanimous-consent agreement that I shall not be held to have lost my place on the floor?

Mr. LUCAS. We will guarantee that the Senator from Florida will not lose his right to the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is with that understanding.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. LUCAS. What I started to say a moment ago, when I was interrupted by my able friend from Georgia, was this: We now have on this petition for cloture, which is being circulated today, the names of 20 Members of the United States Senate, 10 from the Democratic side, 10 from the Republican side. We have circulated the petition only during the last hour. What I intend to do is to place this petition on the desk, in front of the Parliamentarian, merely advising Senators on both sides of the aisle that they will have this afternoon to place their names on the petition, in the event they desire to do so. I am not going to circulate the petition any further. I hope those in charge of the respective sides of the aisle will advise

Democrats and Republicans that the petition for cloture will lie on the table this afternoon for any Senator who may want to sign it, and, sometime probably tomorrow, following the quorum call and a further explanation for the benefit of other Senators who may desire to sign it at that time, we shall then present it.

Mr. President, that practically concludes what I desired to say. I yield the floor, unless some Senator wishes to ask a question.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for an observation, provided he does not thereby lose the floor?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator wishes to make an observation, I ask that the same unanimous-consent agreement be made as was made previously in order to allow the majority leader to make his statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's rights will all be protected.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, those of us who have been vitally interested in the new rule have cooperated with the majority leader in circulating the petition. I am glad he made the observation he did, that in the neighborhood of, I think, 20 Senators signed the petition almost immediately, and that, without any further circulation, the petition will lie upon the table until tomorrow, at whatever hour the distinguished majority leader determines to present it, and that the vote on the petition of course will be, as the majority leader has already stated, automatically at one o'clock on Friday afternoon.

I should like to say this is the first time there has ever been a vote on a cloture petition to take up a motion in the United States Senate, and it really affords an opportunity for those who believe that this motion has been debated for a sufficient length of time, to vote to terminate, without filibuster, further debate on a motion to take up.

As the distinguished majority leader has pointed out, it is vital that each and every Senator be in his seat. An absentee is in reality a negative vote, and as the majority leader has said, each Member who is absent will assume personal responsibility as to whether the motion prevails.

So I join with the majority leader in admonishing those on this side of the aisle, and, indeed, all Senators, that, because of the importance of this vote they should take notice and be present, especially since, as I have said, this is the first time there has ever been an opportunity to terminate debate upon a motion to consider a bill. I hope the membership will be present on Friday afternoon.

While I must confess to the majority leader that because one or two Senators on this side have business of their own involving primaries which will occur on Friday, it would have been to our advantage to have had the vote on Tuesday, yet I realize that no particular date which might be chosen would be satisfactory to 96 Senators.

With that statement, I shall be glad to have the vote on the cloture motion taken on Friday, and I ask full cooperation on the part of Senators on this side of the aisle, as well as on the other side, in carrying out the will of the Senate in this very important matter.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield so that I may make one further brief statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. With the same understanding, I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, supplementing the statement I made a few moments ago, I desire to advise my friends of the press with reference to the agreement I made with them a short while ago that I would read the names from the floor in order that they might have them, that I have changed my mind, in view of the agreement which has been made permitting other Members of the Senate to sign the petition this afternoon. I suppose, when we finally finish the session this afternoon members of the press will be able to get the names.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, are we to understand that the Secretary is acting in the capacity of custodian for the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Nebraska, rather than in his capacity as an official of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, that is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. A point of order, then, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. What constitutes the presentation of a cloture petition if it is not presented when sent to the desk and placed in the hands of officers of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The petition has not been presented during the time the present occupant of the Chair has been presiding.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the point of order is rather nebulous, in the opinion of the Senator from Illinois. All I am trying to do is to accommodate Senators who desire to sign the petition. I did not ask the Parliamentarian or the clerk to take charge of the petition. I think it is proper to place it on one of the little tables in front, where all Senators can see it. I did not want any Senator to influence any other Senator to sign the petition. I want Senators to sign it voluntarily.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think they are likely to do it. Some of them do not belong to a group which could be influenced to sign the petition. I thought it was proper to make it clear that officials of the Senate had this petition as custodian for Senators rather than for the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I would not want any of the officials to assume responsibility. Obviously, it was never so intended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Farrell, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 469. An act for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener;

S. 1145. An act for the relief of Persephone Poulios;

S. 2071. An act for the relief of Mrs. Alice Willmarth;

S. 2258. An act for the relief of Dr. Apostolos A. Kartsonis;

S. 2308. An act for the relief of William Alfred Bevan;

S. 2427. An act for the relief of Masae Marumoto;

S. 2431. An act for the relief of Sumiko Kato;

S. 2443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Georgette Ponsard;

S. 2479. An act for the relief of A. D. Strenger and his wife Claire Strenger;

S. 2568. An act for the relief of Carmen E. Lyon; and

S. 3122. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio, an easement for sewer purposes in, over, and across certain Government-owned lands situated in Maricopa County, Ariz.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 4433. An act to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over certain land in Shirley, Mass.; and

H. R. 4732. An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock Union School district, a political subdivision of the State of California, in Sonoma County, Calif., and to furnish said school district water free of charge.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6171) to authorize commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to administer certain oaths, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I had concluded my brief relation of the efforts to enact FEPC laws in the States of Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, and California. I again invite attention to the map on which the States shown in red, eight in number, have compulsory FEPC laws. The States shown in blue, 19 in number, have defeated or rejected proposed State FEPC laws. The States shown in white, 21 in number, have never considered any FEPC legislation. I again invite attention to the fact that the population of the eight States which adopted FEPC laws is between one-fourth and one-fifth of the population of the entire Nation, taking all population figures from the 1940 census. I have stated to the Senate that the latest estimate of population, last year, shows no substantial proportional change in the situation.

Mr. President, I know perfectly well that there are certain cities which have FEPC ordinances, which lie outside the

States which have that kind of measures. I have asked the Library of Congress to prepare a list of such cities, and I ask at this time to have it incorporated in the RECORD, indicating opposite the name of each city the date on which it adopted an FEPC ordinance. I call the names hurriedly, in passing. They are the cities of Chicago; Milwaukee; Cincinnati; Minneapolis; Philadelphia; Phoenix, Ariz.; Richmond, Calif.; and Cleveland, Ohio.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIES THAT HAVE FEPC IN SOME FORM

(Information obtained from Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service)

1. Chicago: August 21, 1945 (applies to city employees and public contracts).
2. Milwaukee: May 13, 1946.
3. Cincinnati: June 5, 1946.
4. Minneapolis: January 31, 1947 (general FEPC).
5. Philadelphia: March 16, 1948.
6. Phoenix: April 27, 1948.
7. Richmond, Calif.: May 16, 1949.
8. Cleveland: March 12, 1950.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think it is interesting to observe, and I ask all Senators to make particular note of the fact, that although some of the cities adopted FEPC ordinances or measures as long ago as 1945 and 1946, the cities which have adopted such an ordinance lie outside the States which have enacted FEPC legislation. I think that is of considerable importance, because it indicates rather clearly, first, that this kind of legislation seems to be most desired by urban dwellers in great centers in which there are large minority groups, particularly industrial centers, and, in the second place, it indicates rather clearly that the great mass of people who live in small cities, towns, and villages, and upon farms, have not been attracted by what they have seen in the way of FEPC legislation and enforcement in the several cities which I have mentioned. I think that is of importance, because it indicates rather conclusively that when we consider the people as a whole, apart from persons in great cities, they do not want FEPC legislation.

Mr. President, I invite particular attention—and I note with interest that the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is on the floor—to the fact that a great city of his State, Minneapolis, adopted on January 31, 1947, more than 3 years ago, an FEPC ordinance of a compulsory nature, that the ordinance has been in effect and, as I have heard, has been enforced, since that time, but that his State legislature, since that time, has declined and refused to adopt proposals to enact State-wide legislation for the State of Minnesota. To the contrary, Mr. President, in 1949, at the end of a stormy session in which the Republican governor and the leadership of both parties had been trying to have State FEPC legislation adopted for the State of Minnesota, such proposed legislation was knocked down by a hostile vote in the senate of 34 to 29. It seems to me that if the good people of Minnesota, having had a chance to observe the situation in the city of Minneapolis, the largest city of the State, could have been persuaded that it was something worth while, sound, good, and wholesome, they would certainly have taken the opportunity to vote for it. As I say, the leadership of both parties were endeavoring to put it across, but the State senate knocked it down by a vote of 34 to 29, and the lower house of the Minnesota Legislature declined to report it from the committee.

Mr. President, I had the opportunity to make some observations in the course of a debate some weeks ago with the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] who, I regret, is not on the floor at this time. In the course of the debate he was given the opportunity to comment upon the situation not only in Minnesota, but in the other States of the Nation, 19 of which have declined to pass FEPC laws. I want to read into the RECORD the words of the junior Senator from Minnesota in giving his explanation as to why State adoption was not obtained. Those words appear in a pamphlet printed by the American Forum of the Air. It was in a debate in that forum that the remarks were made. They appear in the following words:

I am glad my friend in Florida brought up the legislatures, because legislatures in this country are the most unrepresentative bodies in America.

Then, a little later, I remarked:

I am sorry, Mr. Moderator, that my distinguished friend does not believe in the type of democratic action that prevails in the State house of Minnesota.

To which the junior Senator from Minnesota replied in these words:

I surely don't.

Then, a little later, in the same record, the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota had these further observations to make about legislatures—and I am particularly regretful, Mr. President, that any such comments should have been made with reference to the representative quality or character of State legislatures, for they are close to the people and generally respond very quickly and faithfully to the reaction of their people. It seems to me that State legislatures are highly representative, and that they are the custodians of a great part of the responsibility of our system of democratic government.

I read the later quotation.

Mr. THYE rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like first to read this further quotation. After I have read it I shall be very glad to let the distinguished Senator defend his colleague.

Mr. THYE. I should like to say that I shall not attempt to defend my colleague. However, I should like to defend my legislative colleagues of Minnesota.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator, and I assure him that the Senator from Florida was glad to go to bat for the integrity, democracy, and high qualifications of the good citizens who, I am perfectly sure, comprise the majority of the members of both houses of the legislature of the great and good State of Minnesota, which has sent to the Senate the great and good man who formerly served as Governor of the State, the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator yield now, or does he wish first to complete his statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will bear with me, I should like to complete reading the second quotation. Following that I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

I quote from the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]:

One more thing about the legislatures. I want to repeat that there is no one area of government in the United States that is more lacking in true representation of the majority will of the people than the legislatures.

Mr. President, the Senator's first comment indicted his legislature. I shall yield in a moment, if I may, in order that the distinguished senior Senator from the great State of Minnesota may, as I am sure he will, successfully defend the character and integrity of the representatives of his State in the State Legislature of Minnesota. However, in the second statement the junior Senator from Minnesota assumes greater jurisdiction. He made his remarks applicable in general to the legislative bodies of several States of the Union.

Mr. President, having been for a good many years a member of a State legislature myself, perhaps I am a little tender when it comes to criticisms which I think are improperly made of people who, generally at their own expense, and never with enough money paid to them to defray their expenses, go to their State capital in an effort to serve their fellows, their State, and the Nation. It seems to me it was peculiarly unfortunate for the advocates of FEPC to resort to this kind of defense when it is called to their attention, as it must be, that 19 States of the Union—all the States which the Senate can see depicted in blue on the chart—when proposals for the establishment of a State FEPC organization were presented to their State legislation for action either favorably or unfavorably, rejected the proposals and refused to regard them as a proper type of legislation to be adopted for the governance of the people of those great States.

I shall reread the last quotation:

One more thing about the legislatures. I want to repeat that there is no one area of government in the United States that is more lacking in true representation of the majority will of the people than the legislatures.

In closing, and just prior to yielding to my good friend the senior Senator from Minnesota, I may say to the contrary that I think the fact that legislatures in 19 States—in some States four succeeding legislatures, in most States three succeeding legislatures—rejected such proposals and refused to be driven by minority pressure into the enactment of FEPC legislation for their States should not bring that kind of reward from anyone. I think that kind of statement should be publicized widely as the sort of defense which advocates of FEPC make when they are confronted with adverse rulings and decisions by the fine

and democratic people, whether they be Democrats or Republicans, who serve in the legislatures of the States of the Union.

If I may now do so without prejudicing my rights, I should like to yield to the senior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I thank the very able Senator from Florida for yielding. As I said before, I shall not attempt to defend my colleague. However, having had the privilege of serving as Lieutenant Governor of Minnesota and thereby being privileged to serve as the presiding officer of the State legislature, and having been privileged to serve as Governor, I became very well acquainted with all the legislative members of both branches of the Legislature of Minnesota. I would say that that legislative body is as good a legislative body as will be found in any State. We elect the members of both houses without party designation. Therefore, we cannot point our finger and say, "This is the action of the Democratic Party," or, "This is the action of the Republican Party." Minnesota is a highly agricultural State. Minneapolis is its largest city, followed by St. Paul and Duluth. Many members of the legislature come from areas of the State as representatives of predominantly agricultural communities. We have never had serious trouble on the question of fair employment practices, because we are, as I said, a highly agricultural or rural State. I presume I could say without much contradiction that members of the legislature coming from a community where they have never heard any complaint of unfair employment practices would not have a strong conviction to protect a citizen against employment discrimination. Those of us who have had the privilege of serving in public capacities in the State know of instances where there has been employment discrimination.

It is for that reason that I personally, even though I come from a rural section of Minnesota, support the FEPC bill. In fact, I have signed the cloture petition. I definitely feel that if there is employment discrimination it should be corrected, because if I were an individual who had been discriminated against I would feel exceedingly unhappy, and I would try to apply to others the consideration I would have others apply to me.

Because I was privileged to serve as Governor of Minnesota—and I know that during that same time the able Senator from Florida was serving as Governor of his State, because we met in several Governors' conferences—I would say to my distinguished friend that even though Minnesota is a strictly agricultural State, I personally feel that the underprivileged should be protected. I feel that if a person is subjected to discrimination of any kind those of us who are privileged to serve in public office should try to protect him. I have supported FEPC legislation. I defend the members of the legislative body of my State because it is composed of honorable men. They have excellent and good intentions. I know that if they voted against such legislation they did it with a strong conviction that it was not necessary. I wish they had voted for it. However, I do not criticize a man for that, because I believe he voted the dictates of his heart, rather than the dictates and influences pressing on him.

I say again that I defend the members of the legislature of my State. The Senator from Florida and I may differ on a legislative question, but we do not condemn one another. We are oftentimes misjudged and condemned because we have voted in a certain manner in the Senate. When we have done so people have thought that we either acted contrary to our beliefs or we had been influenced unduly by certain political pressure. At the same time, never have I condemned a man because of his vote, since I know he voted according to his conviction, and possibly a year or 2 years later something may occur which would change his mind, and he might vote contrary to the very vote he cast 2 years before, in another legislative term or session.

Therefore, I say to the very distinguished and able Senator from Florida that I find myself entertaining a different conviction from that entertained by him on this legislative question. But I do not condemn him because of his conviction. I merely say that I recognize that his conviction is an honest one, and my honest conviction is that I should vote for such a measure as that we are discussing if I have the privilege of doing so in the Senate in the next few days or in the next few weeks. I hope we may vote on it. I hope the debate may not run so long that we will not reach a vote. I hope the cloture petition will result in limiting debate, and that we can actually reach a vote on the measure itself, because fair employment practices, if carried out in the manner in which the bill provides, are worthwhile, in my humble opinion.

It must be terrible to be an individual who is being discriminated against. The Senator and I have not suffered that type of experience, but I assert that if I were in a minority, and found definitely that I was being discriminated against, and that I could not in any sense protect myself, I would be very unhappy. We know that any man under those circumstances would be unhappy, and, as such, he would not be as good a citizen as one who felt his country gave him the same opportunity others enjoyed. So again I say I hope we can reach a vote on the measure. I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. As always, he is magnificent in his tolerance and in his understanding, and I have perfect confidence that he will do what he thinks is right.

Sometimes the background from which we come forces us to different conclusions. I note from the census figures for 1940 covering the Senator's own great State of Minnesota that, as against a white population in that year of 2,768,000, a little over two and three-quarter million whites, there resided in his great State in that year 9,928 Negro citizens, and 13,390 citizens of other races. I would not know who they were, but I suppose they would be largely Indians.

Mr. THYE. They would be Indians, because we have quite a sizable Indian population.

Mr. HOLLAND. The figures show a total of approximately 23,000 people in the Senator's State other than whites, out of over 2,750,000 population, whereas in the same year, 1940, in my own State—another good State—the figures were these: White, 1,381,000; Negro, 514,000; other races, 1,230, the latter, I assume, being largely the Seminole Indians in Florida. So that, as the Senator will see, there are very great differences between the backgrounds, from the population standpoint, in his State and my State. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent, if the Senator will yield for that purpose, that I may make a correction of the RECORD regarding the incident which occurred in connection with the 1946 discussion on FEPC with the understanding that the Senator will not lose his right to the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to make the unanimous-consent request, and I hope it will be granted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Earlier in the debate this afternoon I stated that we of the North have been somewhat discouraged in this matter because of what happened in the Senate in 1946, when the FEPC bill came up after hearings had been held by the Senate committee.

I said that we were discouraged because there had been an evident intention then to delay the consideration of FEPC through technical parliamentary points which were made. That is true.

However, I was in error as to the precise parliamentary point which was made, and I should like to correct the RECORD on that point now. I said that a southern Senator objected to the prayer of the Chaplain of the Senate on the ground that it did not make a proper reference to Deity. That, as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] pointed out, was an error. What happened was that on the 17th day of January the Chaplain of the Senate, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, offered a prayer, which was printed, as usual, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but which, as usual, was not printed in the Journal of the Senate. The difference between the Journal and the RECORD is known to every Senator. The Journal merely records the acts of the Senate, while the RECORD reports the debates and full procedures.

The prayer of the Chaplain on the 17th of January was included in the RECORD for that day, as always, but it was not included in the Journal, since prayers never had been included in the Journal.

On the following day, the then Senator from Louisiana, Senator Overton, rose and refused to join in the approval

of the Journal for the preceding day on the ground that the prayer had not been included, and made a motion that the prayer be so included. The motion was debated for some days, and I believe that if there had been a desire on the part of our friends from the South that it be brought to a test, it probably could have been rather quickly brought to a vote.

Some days later the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] moved to lay the motion of the Senator from Louisiana on the table, and that motion was agreed to. But almost immediately thereafter the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY] moved that all those Senators who had not answered to the quorum call on the 17th of January should have their names listed in the Journal. Again, I may say, it had not previously been the practice to list the names of the absent Senators in the Journal, and the practice was instead to list only the names of those who did answer to the quorum call. The motion of the Senator from North Carolina was debated for some days.

In other words, while the Senator from Illinois was technically inaccurate in the reference he made about the precise grounds of objection, I think he was completely accurate regarding the spirit of what went on. It was about that spirit that I wanted to comment, namely, that while I would have preferred that we actually hold hearings on the FEPC bill in the committee, we were discouraged from doing so because of what happened on the floor of the Senate in 1946, when one technical point after another was raised to prevent the bill from even being considered.

We are dealing here with grave matters, and I know that there is always a temptation to resort to technical parliamentary defenses in order to prevent action which one fears will be hostile to the interests of the section or group which we hold closely at heart.

If that program is carried through, however, we really come back to Calhoun's theory of concurrent majorities, namely, that no action shall be taken by a majority of the Senate or the House unless it is also a majority of each and every section or group which has representatives on the floor of the Senate or House. Calhoun's theory has been repeatedly discussed, but I do not think it has ever become part of the constitutional procedure of the country.

Without wishing to read a lecture to anyone, I think if we would all be more willing to agree to a decision of the majority, it would be better for the country as a whole. I should like to point out to my good friend that already, by the system of equality of representation of the States, the small States have been given great protection in this body and the South has also been given a great deal of protection. We do not wish to be unfair to any section, but we do believe that matters as important as this should at least be allowed to be considered.

I want to thank my good friend from Florida for the courtesy he has shown in permitting me to make this statement in correction of the RECORD. I think the RECORD will show that the substance of what I said was correct, even though the precise ground on which the late Senator from Louisiana, Mr. Overton, made his objection, was not correctly stated.

I want to thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois. I am glad to have him so meticulously straighten out this matter affecting prayer. I suspect it would not hurt either the Senator from Illinois, the Senator from Florida, or any other Senators in this body if we gave more attention to that subject. I am glad the Senator from Illinois was so careful to see that whatever he had said about that important subject was correctly shown in the RECORD.

I may say before the Senator leaves, however, that there is one thing he has said that I think he would not have said if he had given really accurate thought to the situation in which the Senate finds itself. He has stated, as I understand, that the reason why he is inclined to reject the idea of any considerable discussion of a motion to take up was that something happened in 1946 having to do with the prayer, and under the rules which prevailed then and not now.

I call to the distinguished Senator's attention the fact that he is again doing what some little while ago he warned the Senator from Florida not to do. He is permitting the dead hand of the past, even under a past rule which does not now exist at all, to becloud his vision and to cause him to become set in his views against something which is going on here now which is not at all governed by the rule then prevailing, and is not at all comparable to what was done then. Instead, the Senate is proceeding under another rule which does allow cloture on a motion to take up, a rule which by the way is a decided improvement over the old one, and which was adopted by the vote of the very Senators against whom the Senator inveighs from time to time as being from below the Mason and Dixon's line, but over the disapproving vote, as the Senator from Florida recalls, of the distinguished junior Senator from Illinois——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Who, the Senator from Florida correctly recalls, was not among those who voted for the substitution of the new, sounder, and saner rule for the old rule of which the Senator now complains. I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator when he reads the RECORD of what he said, will not want to express the opinion that the Senator from Illinois inveighs against those from below the Mason and Dixon's line. If the Senator from Illinois has ever done that he certainly is most apologetic. I do not believe that the RECORD will ever show that he has. He has characterized many of those who live in the South as coming from below the Mason and Dixon's line, but he has never inveighed against them. On the contrary he has tried to treat them in a gentlemanly fashion, both by word and act.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida may now say something very clearly. The Senator from Florida does not recall that any other Senator who has been in this body has referred to the Senators from the South as the Senators from below the Mason and Dixon's line except the Senator from Illinois. He has referred to us in that way a great many times within the hearing of the Senator from Florida, which is quite an appropriate designation, but not customarily made by other Senators. The Senator from Florida thinks that Senators from the South have just about the same attitude respecting great questions of national policy, respecting questions of the safety, the security of the Nation, and the soundness of legislation, as have Senators from any other section of the Nation. We are not accustomed to thinking of Senators as coming from either our part of the Nation or from Chicago, Ill., or from some other part of the Nation, no matter how remote or how different in philosophy the people there may be from the people who have sent the southern Senators to this body. We think of ourselves all as Members of the United States Senate commissioned to do the same job. Without desiring at all to say anything that would be unpleasant or even hinting at such a thing, the Senator from Florida wishes again to say that in no case except by the remarks of the junior Senator from Illinois, does the Senator from Florida remember any Senator having adverted, and particularly at numerous times, to his colleagues from the South as Senators from below the Mason and Dixon's line. So I hope that the Senator may retrace his steps on that and decide that that is not a necessary feature of his service in the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President and Senators, there is one more point I should like to make at this stage before I go to the latter portion of my remarks.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think it would be better for me to proceed for a moment, and later I shall be glad to yield.

Referring to the maps which appear in the back of the Chamber, I again remind Senators of the fact that on the map to which I point the States shown in red are the only States which have a compulsory FEPC. They are 8 in number. The States shown in blue, 19 in number, are the States which have rejected FEPC legislation for themselves. The total population of those 19 States is considerably more than 2 to 1 as compared to the States which have adopted FEPC legislation.

The States shown in white, 21 in number, are States which have not given any consideration to FEPC legislation, for the reason, presumably, that they regard it as unworthy of serious consideration.

Mr. President, I call attention to the other map for a moment, because I want Senators to realize what it is that is being suggested by way of voting upon 40

States, and upon the people of 40 States, 19 of whom have rejected the philosophy of FEPC, and voting upon the Nation as a whole, a concept of governmental interference in employment practices which has been regarded as acceptable and satisfactory in only 8 States of the Nation, whereas the other 40 have not so regarded it. I want that to be contrasted with the effort, with the approach, which we made toward prohibition a good many years ago in good faith, and with the desire to attain an objective, and after the people of most of the States of the Union had decided that for their own governments, for their own States, they wanted prohibition. Thirty-three States—and the map to which I point shows the 33 States in red—had voted State prohibition, either constitutionally so or by statute, most of them by constitutional provision, before the adoption of the Federal constitutional amendment for national prohibition.

I simply wanted in passing to give this contrast to the Senate and to the public between the approach then made and the approach now attempted to be made, which is so completely unwise, as contrasted with the other, I want the people of the Nation to understand that, aside entirely from what the South may want or may think about this matter, the people of the Nation as a whole, outside the South, have expressed themselves by a tremendous majority as not wanting this type of legislation.

Mr. President, lest the contrast with prohibition go too far, I desire to make it very clear that the Senator from Florida is not claiming that prohibition was a success even though it was adopted on a national scale after 33 States had individually provided for it. To the contrary, we all know the melancholy history of that effort. It was not a success. If the Senate will note, many of the same States which have now projected themselves into the State FEPC field were States which would not accept prohibition for themselves, and were therefore among the relatively few States, 15 in number, which were brought along under attempted compulsion by Federal law when the Federal Government embarked on national prohibition. I do not have to remind the Senate that the attempt to drive the people of great States into that field, personal as it was, sumptuary as that legislation was, was a tragic failure, and that it broke down not only the national structure but it broke down the satisfactorily functioning structure in most of the States which had adopted for themselves prohibition prior to that time.

I want the Senate to stop, look, and listen, and to realize what a terrible and tragic comparison there is between this untimely effort and that much more well-timed effort, unsuccessful as it was, in the case of the adoption of national prohibition.

I now yield for a question to my friend the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a few moments ago the distinguished Senator from Florida was discussing with the very able and learned Senator from Illinois the question of committee hearings, and the Senator from Illinois made the point that it was because of fear that this legislation might require extended debate in the Senate that no committee hearings were held.

I simply wanted to ask the Senator if it is not true that usually proper committee hearings reduce the time necessary to dispose of proposed legislation on the floor of the Senate, and that many times it is because of the failure of a committee properly to explore proposed legislation that there occurs in the Senate lengthy debate, which might have been avoided had the committee done its duty and attempted to work out the differences and to reconcile the conflicting points of view?

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the comment, and certainly it is a correct one.

Mr. President, I see that the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] has now come to the floor. I wish to restate what I put in the RECORD—unfortunately, in his absence—a few minutes ago, at the time when I read from the record of his joint debate with the junior Senator from Florida on the subject of FEPC, over the American Forum of the Air, some months ago.

I may say to the Senator from Minnesota, in order that he may understand clearly what I have done, that in discussing the subject of the rejection of FEPC legislative proposals on the State level by numerous State legislatures within the Nation—19 in all—I commented on the position taken by the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota in the course of that debate, and I quoted from his remarks the following words:

> Now let's go into the legislatures for a while. I am glad my friend in Florida brought up the legislatures, because the legislatures in this country are the most unrepresentative bodies in America.

I made no pretense of reading the entire record, although of course the Senator from Minnesota may put all of it into this RECORD if he wishes to do so.

A little later, in response to my comment—

> I am sorry, Mr. Moderator, that my distinguished friend doesn't believe in the type of democratic government that prevails in the statehouse in Minnesota.

The Senator from Minnesota replied:

> I surely don't.

A little later, in the course of the debate, I quoted these remarks by my distinguished friend:

> One more thing about the legislatures. * * * I want to repeat that there is no one area of Government in the United States that is more lacking in true representation of the majority will of the people than the legislatures.

Mr. President, I quote these statements again at this time, now that the junior Senator from Minnesota has arrived on the floor of the Senate, simply because I want to make it very clear that I regretted that he was not here when I made the statement earlier today.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I simply want the Senator to know that it is my intention properly to reply to the comments he has made, and at the same time to present some factual material pertaining to the observations the Senator from Florida has made.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I simply wanted to make it clear in the RECORD that I was completely willing to discuss the matter objectively and dispassionately, just as the discussion occurred with the Senator on the previous occasion.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the Senators from States which have rejected FEPC proposed legislation up to this time have not seen fit to take the floor of the Senate in behalf of the action of the majority of their State legislatures, which repeatedly—for two, three, or four sessions, and most of them for three sessions—have rejected FEPC proposals. I say that because I think such Senators could speak much more accurately regarding the attitude of their people and of the members of their State legislatures than could anyone else.

However, I may say that we have endeavored to get the gist of the argument which runs through the various newspaper reports, through the various reports of committees, and through other documents which tend to show the arguments which were most persuasive in bringing on the results which developed in the various State legislatures.

I present, without any intention whatsoever of holding them out as being an exclusive listing of the reasons why the people of the several States have so clearly and conclusively in 19 cases rejected the setting up of a State FEPC, first, the question of constitutionality. As to that question, I am not able to give the arguments which were advanced. I realize perfectly well that they are different from the arguments which would be made here, where the principal arguments would be made on the ninth and tenth amendments to the United States Constitution. However, apparently that was one of the strong grounds of argument and differences of opinion, because the record shows that numerous States in their legislative proceedings did consider the submission of constitutional amendments to be voted upon and considered by the people of their States—indicating very clearly that they felt a strong question of constitutionality was involved.

In every case which has been brought to my attention—and I have tried to get the background of the argument in each case—and in every case in which the argument was submitted to the legislature for its consideration, the legislature declined to submit such a constitutional amendment to the people for their approval or disapproval.

The second thing which seems to have disturbed them greatly is the point that

the important property right which belongs to every employer and every manager of property to be free in the selection of his own employees, was adversely affected in a way which the legislatures apparently thought was completely incompatible with American free enterprise and the American way of doing things.

In passing, I call the attention of the Senate briefly to the point that this matter not only relates to the qualifications, so far as training, experience, and ability to do a particular job with head or hand are concerned, on the part of a particular applicant, but it also goes much deeper than that, because it runs to the question of whether or not the applicant is, in the judgment of a property owner who operates his business, best suited to work cooperatively under the owner or the management with other employees who already are there. I call attention to the fact that one of the greatest tests of sound executive ability is not solely the question of getting well-qualified personnel, but also the question of getting personnel who can work well with each other and can constitute a good team who can get things done.

I also call the attention of the Senate—and apparently this was one of the subject matters frequently debated in the legislatures of the several States—to the fact that the freedom of selection of employees is hopelessly diminished by the proposed intervention in the form of either State law or a Federal law, if one were passed by the Congress, and that that interference constitutes the deprivation of an important property right which pertains to the property and its enjoyment and the making of it to pay dividends to give back what it should give back in the way of earnings to the owner.

The third thing which I notice was debated was the freedom of the selection of associates, particularly as applicable to unions. Unions have always felt that they had a definite concern in the matter of choosing and having some right to pass upon the qualifications and character and personality of the persons who would serve with them as their associates with full fraternal membership in the body in which all of them were members. That seems to have been one of the questions which was debated. I think all Senators will agree that certainly it is a pertinent question. Before I leave that subject, let me point out to the Senate that not only is the right of the employer involved here, but also this matter involves a very deep and dangerous question running to the matter of the continued and successful functioning of labor unions, because the preferential rights which undoubtedly will accrue to minority employees will also indubitably accrue to minority groups and their members who are members of labor unions, against the ordinary John Doe, the average citizens who also are members, and to the great majority of the membership of the several unions.

The next point I make is the preferential deal that is given to minorities and also the diminished rights of the majority of average American employees. I do not think there is any majority group in this Nation which wishes to withhold from any minority group or any member of it any right to succeed, any opportunity to do well. But he certainly does not want such a right or such an opportunity to be carved out of his own rights, and to leave him with less protection, less security, and less rights; and that is exactly what is intended, and what will be accomplished under this particular measure, if it be adopted. That argument was made in the various States. Evidently it was highly persuasive. Nineteen States knocked it down.

Fifth, the unsound governmental policy of catering to minorities. Mr. President, I do not have to expound that principle to Senators who have grown gray in politics, who know so well that it is the established vogue in politics in this day and time to pander to minority groups and that minority groups in large measure dictate what is in many of our political platforms. That is an unsound condition.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. In a moment. It is unsound, it is undemocratic, and it leaves the country in a position of not putting first things first, and putting first issues out where they will command the greatest importance, but, instead, in the position of trafficking in this or that political deal, which will leave that particular party in the best position to command the vote and support of a minority group or groups in a key State, which may be so nearly in the balance as between the strength of the two great political parties that the minority groups, by going one way or the other, will determine the outcome of the election. I now yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. What would constitute a minority group in one section of the United States might almost be a majority in another section. I have always felt it was my good fortune that, in 1917, I was privileged to serve with men from the deep South while in the air service. I came into Jefferson Barracks, Mo., early one morning, getting off the train from the North. A group of boys came in from Mississippi, Arkansas, and Georgia. We were in a way thrown together. A company was formed. I was about the only northern man in the company with that group of southern boys. I served for practically a year with them. I learned more about the deep South in that year's time than I had ever learned from history books. I may say to the Senator, I believe that when he speaks of minority groups in the northern section of the United States, they would be the majority in the southern part of the United States—I think the Senator will agree with me about—and what we think of in the North as a minority group, would be in the deep South a majority. For that reason, I can fully appreciate what the Senator is confronted with, and I can appreciate what the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], who is sitting here, is confronted with. But, nevertheless, I recognize the great problem fair-employment practices may encounter, and that certain groups which might be a majority in the Senator's section of the country might be a minority in my section of the country.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THYE. I recognize what the Senator is confronted with. That is one reason why the Senator advances the argument he does. But I come back to the first statement I made regarding the man who is discriminated against, who cannot obtain employment, or who is denied this, that, or the other privilege, because of race or color, or because he comes from the wrong side of the railroad tracks, or the wrong side of the village. That man or that person is unhappy, and I am in favor of helping him through the enactment of legislation which will put him on a par with myself and with the Senator in respect to his rights and opportunities.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, or, rather, that I may make a statement at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi for the purpose of asking the Senator from Florida a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Speaking for the State of Mississippi, there is certainly no discrimination in employment in that State because of race, color, or national origin. In all the hearings which are talked about, there will not be found a scintilla of proof that there is discrimination in Mississippi or in any other State of the deep South. I deny most emphatically any statement that there is discrimination in my State based on race or color.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will permit me to make a reply to the able Senator from Mississippi——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to yield for a few minutes to the Senator from Minnesota, for the purpose stated, without losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I do not want the able Senator from Mississippi to labor under the mistaken thought that I was in any sense attempting to convey the idea that there was discrimination, insofar as employment is concerned, against any individual or group in the State of Mississippi. I do not believe I made that statement, but, if I did, or if I left the impression that I was trying to convey such an idea, I do not want the matter to be left in that way. What I was answering was the argument of the very able Senator from Florida, and what I said was that what constituted a minority in one section of the United States might well constitute a majority in another section. I was not referring to discrimination in Mississippi against one group or class of people.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think I correctly understood the Senator from Minnesota, and, without recognizing any situation at all, or any State in which that is the case—and that would certainly be possible—the position of the

Senator from Florida would be exactly the same in any such case. The question is whether the long hand of the Federal law should be extended to the point of regimentation of private business, seeking to assume control in such matters as the hiring and firing of an employee for reasons which seemed sufficient to the owner or manager of the business. I think that too few of the advocates of this legislation have given any consideration at all to this fact, which is an undoubted fact, that the quality which real executive ability displays is not necessarily the ability to find a person well qualified to serve, because generally the field is large. Executive ability shows itself best in the selection of people who can work together, who can work together and turn out a very much greater job together than they could if there were friction or misunderstanding between them.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I can think of no greater disservice that could be done to a prospective employee than to allow him to be employed as a member of a personnel group in employment where the employer knew in advance that he could not possibly get along, that he could not possibly be happy, that he would not be fairly treated, or knew what would be even more to the point, that the employer himself did not trust that applicant, did not trust that employee, or did not believe that he personally could get along with him.

Mr. President, this matter of choosing employees goes so much further than the mere matter of looking for qualifications, as they do in civil service.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Before yielding to my friend I must add this additional thought. It seems to me that what the misguided friends and advocates of FEPC are doing is trying to set up a sort of grandiose civil-service operation, to operate in all the businesses of the Nation and to have the sole question, whenever an applicant comes forward, this: Can he do this job? Is his training and experience such that he can do it under all possible circumstances, without reference to what those circumstances or what those surroundings would be?

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Minnesota has been a successful governor of his great State, and I know perfectly well that his success and the fine record he left there, the splendid reputation which he bears there, is not confined simply to his finding men who could do the job, but the finding of men who, as his key men, his little cabinet, his appointees, men who made his record for him in large part, because, speaking from experience, I know that no governor by himself can do very much of the hard work that has to be done; he chose men who could work with each other and who were sold on his philosophy, sold on the way he wanted to get things done, and who were not simply trained or experienced so that they should have been able to turn out a good job in that particular post.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator agree that the great underlying controversy here is whether we shall deprive the American people of a right inherent in citizenship, a right which is inherent in free men, which is the right of freedom of association? Without that right there can be no such thing as human freedom in the United States. Is not that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly correct. The Senator will recall that one of those who so ably debated the question on the floor, quoted two or three times from the words of Justice Brandeis with reference to freedom to be let alone, freedom to do business as one sees fit, which is a freedom of incalculable value and benefit. Without it we would be no longer Americans. The advocates of this un-American measure seek to take away that right to be let alone in the handling of their own business, the selection of their employees and associates. They seek to deprive the American people of a heritage which goes back before the foundation of this Nation, and it attaches itself to our form of law and of society. They want to make us over. I say, with all respect, to my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who has convictions, that I think he is wrong, just as he doubtless thinks the Senator from Florida is wrong.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator believe that if the Congress of the United States has the power, under the Constitution, to pass a law infringing upon the right of freedom of association or freedom of employment, a great hoax has been perpetrated on the people of the country? We have been deceived. It is not a free country, if such a power is in the American Congress. Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree implicitly. I do not believe there is any such power. If there is such power, our founding fathers certainly never mentioned it or dreamt of it, and never sought to engraft that sort of thing upon their employment practices or their living practices. They went forth as free men. They looked out on that great area, which has since become the great State of Minnesota, for individuals who were strong and sturdy and who would go with them to help make the land fruitful. They were looking for people with whom they could work.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. The very fact that the Senator and I are here is because some of our ancestors did not like the yoke under which they lived in their respective communities and countries, and they were willing to face the hardships of crossing the ocean, in all its vastness, to come to America and blaze trails across the wilderness to establish homes and communities for the privilege of being free men and free women and for the privilege of doing things in accordance with their own convictions.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. That is why the Senator and I are here, is it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is exactly right. When opportunities were offered, they were not parceled out among so many Catholics and so many Protestants, among so many white persons and so many colored persons, among so many English and so many Scotch persons. They were given to persons who were willing to stand by each other loyally. They settled together as friends and associates. They chose each the other, and they did not even think about such things as those which would be placed in dominant position by the passage of this particular bill. The Senator has made out our case completely. We do not want to be dividing the sheep and the goats. I know the Senator from Minnesota does not try to parcel out the opportunities in connection with his broad farm lands in Minnesota, among particular groups. He is looking for men and women who can get the job done.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. THYE. The Senator has very ably stated the situation. We do not examine applicants for employment to see whether they have some individual characteristic. We choose an individual because we think he can serve us best in the capacity in which he is employed. When we were blazing trails across the wilderness in this great land there was no question of employment discrimination, because every hand was needed to do the job which lay before the early settlers. But today we are finding conditions a wee bit different in some of our densely populated areas. When the man is seeking the job there can be discrimination. During the war years the job was seeking the man, and, therefore there was no discrimination, and the question was not nearly so acute as it was prior to World War II and as we can anticipate it at some future time.

It does not make me happy to argue this particlar question with my friend from Florida, but inasmuch as I was drawn into it by the reference to the State legislature of Minnesota, I found myself compelled to try to defend my convictions. I am not attempting to be argumentative with the Senator from Florida. I was defending myself because the State of Minnesota, which I in part represent, was brought into the debate.

I am very strong in my conviction that fair employment is a question which should be not only debated, but actually voted on, because, while it is not a tremendously important question in Minnesota, I recognize that in some of the metropolitan areas in other States it is a very important question. In future years we may find it more acute than we have known it to be in the past.

If I may impose a little more on the time of the able Senator from Florida, I should like to comment to this extent, that during the war years, when it was an easy matter for a disturbance to

break out in an industrial plant, or a war factory in metropolitan centers, I was sitting in the governors' conference at Columbus, Ohio, with the Senator from Florida and with the Governor of Michigan, and other governors, when information came to the Governor of Michigan that a riot was taking place in one of the industrial centers of his State. He had to leave the governors' conference so that he could be on hand at the point where the riot was taking place.

After the conference I returned to my State and assembled a group of men and women, and said, "I do not want any such mob action to disrupt the normal functions of industries in my State." I wanted their advice as to how we might organize to meet such a contingency. Out of that conference came the Interracial Commission, in which all classes of people and all religious beliefs were cemented in one organization. Very little disturbance occurred. We had a splendid record of labor achievement in Minnesota and in racial attitudes and feelings of persons towards one another. I was always grateful to those who helped me in bringing about the organization of the Governors' Interracial Commission.

So I say to the Senator from Florida that while I know it is a problem to the Senator and to other Senators in Southern States, I feel that it is a question which we should be able to answer. If we cannot find the answer in the bill which is before us, let us amend it into such a form that there can be no race discrimination, so that a man who was born with a certain color of skin shall not be denied that which another man is permitted to have. That is my conviction.

I am one who was born of immigrants, and whose way was not easy. I could not speak the language of the land when I first entered public school. I could not speak the language that was spoken at school. Consequently I suffered much in the way of being ribbed, kidded, and mimicked, until I mastered the language. Perhaps I am somewhat sensitive about the man who cannot meet the circumstances and the environment in which he finds himself. He may not be able immediately to fit himself into the working conditions that exist in a plant. However, if we give him an opportunity he will fit himself into the plant and into the working conditions. While he may not be qualified today, if we help him, give him the opportunity, he will become qualified. It is for that reason that I have such strong convictions about FEPC legislation. Unless a man is given the opportunity to demonstrate his willingness, desire, and intelligence to learn he will never get there. He will be on a different level for all time to come, and so will his children. It is for that reason that I enter into debate even with one whom I so highly respect and like as I do the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. May I say that the Senator may be correct in his view that there was no discrimination in his good State in the early days. I suspect that the forefathers of the 13,000 Indians who are still in his State might have debated the subject with him. I remember as well as he the matter of the calling of the distinguished former Governor of Michigan from the governors' conference to handle the riot in Detroit. We who gathered at the Governors' conference knew that the riot had not happened because the white people or the colored people in Detroit wanted it to happen. We knew it did not happen because there was no law in Detroit. It happened in the face of the law. These things always happen in the face of the law. They cannot be solved by purely legal technique. The good Senator from Minesota knows that perfectly well.

We people in the South, as other people in the Nation, have been striving with all the strength we command to solve peaceably and with good will and understanding the problems which exist in our part of the country. We have gone a long, long way in solving them. As long as the Senator has mentioned the matter of violence, I should like to invite his attention to the fact that the sum total of violence which has occurred, all of which we deplore, in this field in the Southeastern States in recent years, does not begin to equal, in terms of individuals whose lives were taken or people who were hurt and sent to the hospital, to what has happened in areas of the country farther north. The Senator mentioned the riot in Detroit. My recollection is that 34 lives were lost and something over 500 people taken to the hospital. That same year in the Harlem riot five lives were lost and some 500 people were taken to the hospital. In more recent times, as the Senator will recall, we have had the so-called Peekskill riot in New York. That riot did not happen because there was no law. Sometimes these things break out in the very face of the law. There is a good deal of the human in all of us. A law goes as far as it can in keeping down or preventing grotesque manifestations of human hatred, but those manifestations are not entirely eliminated by any law. So it was with the recent riot in Harlem on the night after the convicted Communists were released on bail. Quite a number of policemen of the city of New York, who were simply trying to maintain order, had to be taken to the hospital. In addition, a great amount of property was destroyed, and many people were hurt. In those parts of the country where many fewer Negroes—to speak of one particular minority—are present than are found in other parts of the country, and where people look with as much aversion as we in the South look on such things, there has been vastly more trouble and vastly more deaths, more injuries, and there has been vastly more trouble of the type that I have just been mentioning a while ago than occurred throughout the southland.

Mr. President, before leaving this point, let me remind the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that down in our part of the country, where some 45,000,000 people reside—from Kansas City to Miami, and from Baltimore to the Rio Grande—of those 45,000,000 about 34,000,000 are of the same color as the Senator and myself, and about 11,000,000 are human beings, our brethren, who happen to be of a different color. We are having a better performance in the field of violence than is being had anywhere else in the country. I say it would be a fatal blunder, even though it may be a well-intended movement, to try to put the dominant hand of the Federal Government into this matter of employment practices and the kindred matters which go along with it and are part of this problem, which I had intended to mention a little later. We are making tremendous progress, and we are making it rapidly. We want to make it without intervention and without interruption and without having the hand of the Federal law come in. It is a hand which does not understand our problem. We would not attempt to tell the distinguished Senator from Minnesota how to handle the 13,000 Indians in his State. We do not know anything about those problems. Nor would we undertake to tell the good people of New Mexico how to handle their Mexicans, or the Californians how to handle their orientals. Neither would we undertake to tell the people of New York State how to handle their manifold minorities, which when added up, almost constitute a majority. We are content to let them handle their own problems. We know that they will handle them soundly and in accordance with the best American traditions and customs. We do not believe it to be sound government or sound planning to have someone sitting here in the cloistered Senate of the United States, who knows nothing at all about the juxtaposition of 11,000,000 people of one color with 34,000,000 people of another color in every town, hamlet, and community in the Southland, to try to assert his judgment, as in the case of the Senator from Minnesota, for example, based upon his limited personal experience. I do not believe the Senator from Minnesota would wish to impose his judgment in a a field which we know to be one of the most difficult fields offered in human relations and which must be solved by human minds.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 7

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, without taking the Senator from Florida from the floor I want to announce that tomorrow, immediately after we get through with the routine business which plagues every session of the Senate, I expect to make a motion to bring up for consideration Senate Resolution 253, which deals with Reorganization Plan No. 7. I understand that motion is not debatable. So I give notice that I shall make such a motion tomorrow.

Time for consideration of reorganization plans is running out very rapidly. As I understand we must conclude action with respect to the various plans by May

23. I understand furthermore that the Senate has entered into a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Friday the 18th with respect to cloture. There may be other votes had on the 18th. So the last day on which we may be able to consider reorganization plans will be Monday, May 22. Four resolutions dealing with reorganization plans have been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It is my hope that the Senate can dispose of Senate Resolution 253 which relates to Reorganization Plan No. 7, and Senate Resolution 256 which relates to Reorganization Plan No. 11. I do not believe the debate will take much time tomorrow. I do not expect to speak for more than an hour. I do not believe more than an hour and a half will be required for the affirmative side of the question. I presume those speaking on the negative side will require about the same amount of time. So perhaps we can act on several of the resolutions tomorrow.

The two other Senate resolutions which were reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will probably not require so much time as the first two to which I referred. I think we ought to be able to dispose of all those resolutions tomorrow. I hope we can do so, because on Monday similar resolutions will be brought before the Senate for consideration, and as I stated, it is my understanding that the deadline is the 23d of May. Such resolutions have a high status of preference. I simply wanted to call the Senate's attention to the fact that it was my intention to move to bring up two resolutions for consideration tomorrow.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, while the distinguished majority and minority leaders are present I should like to announce that it is the present intention of the four sponsors of Senate Resolution 263 disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 4, relating to the Department of Agriculture, to move to consider that resolution, if we can secure the floor, immediately after the cloture vote has been had on Friday, regardless of the outcome of that vote.

I may say that I had hoped to have a chance to discuss the matter with the distinguished majority leader in particular. When I took the floor this afternoon the Senator from Illinois had not returned to the Chamber; at least that was my information. I simply wanted to advise him and the distinguished minority leader likewise, that it is the intention of the sponsors of the resolution, who include the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and myself, to move to take up Senate Resolution 263 on Friday. The Senators I have named are the joint sponsors of that particular resolution.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Did I understand the Senator to say that he intended to move to bring up the resolution for consideration after the vote was taken on Friday?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is our intention. I may say that it is not our intention to try to hold the Senate in session for a 10-hour debate. Quite the contrary. We simply feel that Friday, after the vote on the cloture motion, is an acceptable time to move the consideration of the Senate resolution. We believe it to be a timely occasion for consideration of such a motion. I hope the distinguished majority leader will feel that that is in line with a policy which he can approve. I regret that I have not had an opportunity to discuss the matter with him previously.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may state my position as one of the cosponsors of the resolution pertaining to Reorganization Plan No. 4?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. It was my hope that the resolution could be considered in the forepart of next week, either Monday or on Tuesday, I will say to the able Senator from Florida, for the reason that I had intended to ask leave of the Senate to be absent on Friday afternoon beginning possibly at 3 or 4 o'clock; I am scheduled to attend a meeting that evening. It was my hope that we might consider Reorganization Plan No. 4 on Monday or Tuesday of next week, rather on Friday of this week. If it is considered on Friday, it would be most embarrassing to me. I would either have to cancel my engagement or forego taking part in discussion of the resolution on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not care to make the decision alone, as I am only one of four sponsors of the resolution. I have discussed the matter with two other sponsors of the measure. I had not seen the Senator from Minnesota. I thought the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] had conferred with him. It was the expectation to move that the resolution be taken up on Friday evening, and then to have consideration of it go over and that it be the pending business, if the motion were to prevail, when the Senate resumed its session on Monday. That was the expectation.

Mr. THYE. If the resolution can be taken up when the Senate convene on Monday it will be more convenient for me. However, I do not want my desires or wishes to influence the Senate. If the resolution were to be considered on Friday it would be embarrassing for me if the debate lasted a long time on the resolution dealing with Reorganization Plan No. 4 and the vote came late Friday evening.

Mr. HOLLAND. I do not believe there can be any debate at all on the motion to consider the resolution. That motion is to be made as soon as the vote on the cloture petition is disposed of. It is my hope that it will be acceptable to the majority leader that whatever is the result of the vote on the cloture petition, the resolution may go over and be the pending business on Monday when the Senate convenes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. It may be necessary for the Senate to hold some night sessions in order to make proper determination of all the Senate resolutions which have been reported disapproving reorganization plans. I do not know how many such resolutions have been reported, but the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has just stated that he expects to move to take up for consideration two resolutions tomorrow, and that two others have been reported from his committee.

Mr. President, if all the resolutions which may come before the Senate disapproving the various reorganization plans presented by the President of the United States are agreed to, we will wind up, as we always do with respect to reorganization, with no reorganization at all. It is my hope that with respect to most of the plans we may follow the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. Apparently there is going to be controversy with respect to seven or eight of the plans. I shall do all I can to see to it that reorganization is accomplished in line with what the Hoover Commission has recommended and in line with the plans sent to the Congress by the President. The resolutions may require some debate, and we may have to hold some night sessions. If there is going to be any debate, and apparently there is, on the resolution referred to by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], which he expects to move that the Senate proceed to consider on Friday, I should like to have that debate proceeded with, to see if we cannot complete action on the resolution Friday evening, because, as was said a moment ago by the Senator, the time is getting rather late for the final disposition of all these matters.

So I should hope perhaps to get that resolution out of the way Friday afternoon when we conclude action on the cloture petition. Practically all Members of the Senate will be here at that time; probably there will never be a time when more Members of the Senate will be present than on Friday, at 1 o'clock. Certainly it would not be too strenuous for Senators to hold a night session at that time, because we have not held a single night session since the question of the FEPC bill has been before us.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for that purpose, provided I may obtain unanimous consent to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask the majority leader whether he means that if the Senate does proceed to consider the FEPC bill, it will be set aside on Friday in order that the reorganization plan resolutions of disapproval may be considered at that time.

Mr. LUCAS. Oh, no. The Senate will vote on the cloture petition at 1 o'clock on Friday, and of course the length of the proceedings at that time will depend on the number of votes which are had.

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. LUCAS. If 64 Senators do not vote in favor of invoking cloture, we probably will continue the debate. However, of course a motion will be in order to lay aside the pending motion, as has already been done in the case of the two resolutions of disapproval of other reorganization plans. I assume that Senators who favor the disapproval of the other reorganization plans which have been mentioned have the votes to have the Senate set aside the FEPC at any time they wish to have that done. I will not agree to any unanimous-consent request to have that done; if such resolutions of disapproval of reorganization plans are taken up at that time, such action will have to be taken by means of the adoption of a motion to lay aside the FEPC.

However, I will not agree to permit the consideration of FEPC to stand in the way of obtaining action between now and midnight of the 23d of May upon the resolutions of disapproval of the reorganization plans which have been mentioned, even if we have to hold night sessions in order to do so, as I said a moment ago.

Mr. WHERRY. The point about which I asked—I think my question has been answered—was that no Senator is assuming now that the debate on FEPC will terminate if the cloture petition is rejected; and I assume that unless that does occur, the present intention is to press on with FEPC, even though the resolutions of disapproval of the reorganization plans might be taken up temporarily and the FEPC might be laid aside for that purpose, if the attempt to invoke cloture on the FEPC motion is successful.

Mr. LUCAS. Even though we might fail in the effort to invoke cloture on the motion to have the Senate consider the FEPC bill, that will not mean that we shall cease the debate on it.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, let me say that I hope we will continue the debate. I hope we will continue the debate and will defeat any filibuster, if the debate develops into a filibuster. Let us stay here and decide once and for all whether we can or cannot obtain the required two-thirds vote in favor of taking up the FEPC bill on a cloture petition. Let us try this issue.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, that is very brave of the Senator from Michigan. I appreciate the position he takes, and I heartily agree that we certainly should do all we can to obtain 64 votes in favor of having the Senate consider the FEPC bill. I take it that, if the Senator from Michigan had his way, that would mean that if we could not obtain 64 affirmative votes, under the present rule, we would remain here until we did obtain them.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that I will stay with him.

Mr. LUCAS. Just one moment, please.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida permit a further observation by me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a further observation by the majority leader.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, all of us know that, under the rule, amendments can be submitted to the FEPC bill, once it is taken up. All of us know that each Senator has a right to speak twice on every amendment. Therefore, if we can not obtain sufficient votes to invoke cloture, we could be here all summer long, and even up to Christmas.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the way to get action.

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; I know that is the way to get action; and I found out how those on the other side of the aisle in the Eightieth Congress got it in the same way, when they stayed in session such a long time but did not get anything so far as FEPC is concerned. Now they are telling me to have the Senate stay here all fall.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are just offering the aid of Senators on this side of the aisle.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728) to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I decline to yield further.

I regret to have to decline to yield further, but for the last 3 hours I have been trying to finish my speech. There have been a great many questions by other Senators. I hope the Senate can indulge me for perhaps 20 minutes more, in order that I may conclude my remarks.

Mr. President, I had reached the point of the unsound governmental policy of catering to minorities, which was one of the matters which gave great concern to the legislatures of the 19 States which knocked down proposals for State FEPC's; and I think the same consideration applies to any proposed Federal legislation on the subject. I shall not dwell longer upon that point.

The next point which I found was of grave concern was the matter of creating a new, expensive, far-reaching and multi-peopled bureaucracy to rove from one end of a State to the other in an effort to do some key-hole exploring of all the businesses of the State, to determine whether or not there was something which needed attention in each business in the State.

I think we cannot too greatly emphasize that particular point. I believe that the members of the legislatures of the 19 States which have knocked down FEPC proposals are greatly concerned about that particular one, and I believe that the Members of the Senate of the United States are greatly concerned about it. I suspect that there is not a Member of the Senate who did not in his campaign urge the necessity for cutting down and getting rid of governmental bureaus and commissions, and not creating new ones. Yet here it is proposed to create a large bureaucracy with far-reaching implications and with long rolls of personnel, extending to all parts of the United States.

Of course, the same point was made in the State legislature debates. It is true that the bureaucracy for this purpose in the States would be smaller in size; but from the standpoint of the size of the individual State and its ability to carry the expense of such personnel, it would be no whit smaller than the bureaucracy and the personnel to be created under the proposed Federal legislation for FEPC.

The next point which was considered in the State legislatures was the question of the apparent willingness of the people who were sponsors of this sort of proposed legislation to let it be enforced by the pressure of the minority groups, not by law. In the case of the eight States which have FEPC laws, we have not been able to find a single case which has gone to the courts. The advocates of this legislative proposal plead like angels trumpet-tongued for the enactment of this proposed legislation on that ground.

It seems to those of us who oppose the enactment of legislation of this type that there are two things which must be remembered in connection with that sort of situation: First, that that kind of situation will not exist in a State where there is real opposition to FEPC; that FEPC has been created, conceivably, only, in the States where the minority problem is a great and a pressing one and where the minority groups are themselves large and important. Of course, the point does not apply in the case of those particular States.

However, in the case of other States which have voted against FEPC legislative proposals, certainly there would be court trials and court appeals; and we would hope there would be, because only in that way, if such legislative proposals were enacted, could we knock down this un-American proposal which threatens the lives and liberties of all the people of the United States.

Mr. President, one of the things which gave greatest concern to the people of the States, I may say, was the very clear statement that the purchasing power of a community, the power of criticism by the people of a community, the power of minorities in turning the community groups and the civic efforts against anyone who did not seek to comply with such a State law, was being used, and was being used heavily. Mr. President, that is not the way to enforce a law, and it is no way for lawmakers to attempt to proceed. They should not attempt to subject their people to that sort of pressure, because when a law hits deep down into the traditions of this country and proposes to fly in the face of vital traditions and to strike down important inherited rights, we hope there will be many Americans and many American businesses who will make it a matter of first importance to apply the tests of the courts, and of all the courts which can be reached, to the weighing of such legislation, which we believe to be unconsti-

tutional, un-American, unwise, and not at all framed in accordance with the ideology of our fathers.

Mr. President, that brings me down to the next point, which I found of such importance in the California debate and in the decisions made there in the California Legislature following the report of the California legislative committee on un-American activities. The Senate will remember that that report showed at length that more than half of the 63 persons who were active in sponsoring the initiated measure for FEPC in California were known to be Communists. The Senate will remember that the reports of the Library of Congress upon this subject showed conclusively that after that time and since that time there has really been no serious consideration given to any FEPC proposal in California, because, at last, they understood out there that this scheme had its rise in communism, and in Communist philosophy, and that the actors, the agitators in California were themselves Communists in great degree—more than half, as I say, of the 63 men and women who comprised the very active committee which sponsored that initiated measure.

Mr. President, there has recently been a revival of the interest of scholars in this subject, in the fact that the original impetus in this field came from a Communist platform and came from Communist philosophy. Senators will recall that the able columnist, Mr. Arthur Krock, in an article printed in the New York Times, May 11, dealt with the speech made by our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] some days ago on this motion. I shall not read that column of Mr. Krock's at length at this time, but I ask that it be included in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, at this place.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 11, 1950]

IN THE NATION—SENATOR BENTON'S ARGUMENT FOR THE FEPC

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 10—Senator BENTON, of Connecticut, speaking yesterday in favor of the administration's bill to provide Federal penalties for industrial employers and labor unions in all the 48 States who are found guilty by a Fair Employment Practice Commission of racial or religious discrimination, said several times that "the big issue is * * * justice for our own citizens in our own land." But for the many who doubt that a compulsory Federal statute is the right or the constitutional way to effect that justice, Mr. BENTON stressed two other arguments of the type politicians call "practical."

1. He said "our failure to live up to our democratic preachments on civil rights for all Americans regardless of race, religion, color, or national origin, contributes most of the poisonous, tremendous, and terrible effectiveness of Soviet propaganda against this Nation in the world." Hence, he said, passage of this bill would not only be a master stroke in foreign policy but one acutely necessary.

2. Mr. BENTON'S second practical argument was that "more than 98 percent of all enterprises in the United States employ fewer than 50 persons," and "there are not as many employers in the South as I would wish * * * who employ more than 50 persons." Hence, the law would operate in a small area of the industrial economy: "Without the development of the modern corporation it may be questioned whether this legislation would be needed."

GRIST FOR BOTH MILLS

In making these statements Mr. BENTON exposed two features of the administration bill which opponents have found especially vulnerable. They do not see disproof of their belief that the measure is unconstitutional, and bad domestic public policy as well, in the statement that these should be waived in the interest of our foreign policy, as Mr. BENTON and others evaluate it. And Senator CONNALLY remarked that a bill of such high idealistic professions that exempts "98 percent of all enterprises in the United States" is either a sham or is intended as the outrider for another bill which will affect all employers. Senator BENTON'S percentages, and the history of all sumptuary legislation with a modest beginning (such as the local-option laws that became Nation-wide prohibition), certainly support Mr. CONNALLY'S observation.

Mr. BENTON also said:

"The Soviet radio tells the Russian people [and others] that our Constitution was written by representatives of exploiting classes and does not truly guarantee civil rights; that our Congress * * * one of their favorite targets * * * permits the minority to prevail 'because of the poll tax and the filibuster.'"

This led Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, to observe:

"I hope the Senator from Connecticut does not advocate that we should repeal the Constitution because the Communists have been putting out a good deal of false propaganda about it."

Of course, Mr. BENTON did not advocate this. But to those who object to the FEPC bill on constitutional and public-policy grounds this is a logical extension of his argument that the bill should be judged largely on his contention that its approval would destroy a most effective segment of Soviet propaganda.

A CHOICE OF METHODS

As is nearly always the case when people differ fundamentally on an issue, and differ on principle, the reasons given by Mr. BENTON for passing the compulsory FEPC bill seemed to the opposition to fortify its objections. This was true not only of the arguments and answers cited above but of his description how vigorously the State Department is meeting the propaganda he would legislate against and how firmly the Supreme Court has upheld civil rights.

He said the Voice of America broadcasts, which he proposes greatly to expand, have made "most effective use of material on favorable racial developments in the United States. Our broadcasting," he said, "has reported the truth about our progress in this field, about the President's civil-rights program, about the historical background of our race relations, about the opposition of our most prominent Negro leaders to the Communist system, and also about the great civil-rights decisions of our Supreme Court."

To Mr. BENTON this supports his argument that the FEPC bill should be passed to put a clincher on these activities. But to those who disapprove of the bill on law and principle it is proof that this particular Soviet propaganda is being dealt with effectively—the Senator said so—and in the right way, and will be more effective when his expansionist program is adopted.

The origin of the modern drive for this legislation in the United States is also certain to play a part in the Senate debate. According to available records, a detailed demand for the FEPC and other antidiscrimination laws in behalf of Negroes first appeared in the Communist Party platform of 1928 and was published on page 6 of the Daily Worker of May 26 in that year. But, since then, the CIO, and citizens' groups with no possible link to communism, have adopted most of this program, broadened it to cover other minorities, and given it its present political strength.

Mr. HOLLAND. I call particular attention to the last paragraph of Mr. Krock's column, which reads as follows:

The origin of the modern drive for this legislation in the United States is also certain to play a part in the Senate debate. According to available records, a detailed demand for the FEPC and other antidiscrimination laws in behalf of Negroes first appeared in the Communist Party platform of 1928 and was published on page 6 of the Daily Worker of May 26 in that year. But, since then the CIO and citizens' groups with no possible link to communism have adopted most of this program, broadened it to cover other minorities, and given it its present political strength.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Not at the moment. I shall be glad to yield when I complete this point.

In spite of the fact that the CIO has come in and adopted this, in spite of the well-known fact that the CIO has tried to purge itself of Communists, nothing can change the completely irrefutable fact that this particular venture has its roots in and springs directly from a plank of the Communist national platform of 1928.

We requested the Library of Congress, if possible, to get up for us the Communist platform of that year, and we find that it was published in pamphlet form, which we have here. We found also that the page of the Daily Worker which was referred to by Mr. Krock was available, so that we asked for the making of a photostatic copy of that particular page, so that there might be placed in the RECORD this long catalog of declarations of policy, platform declarations on the part of the Communist Party in 1928 as a basis for its campaign, which was aimed directly at winning the Negro vote.

I am going to ask at this time that that portion of the article dealing with the Negro question be included in the RECORD at this time as a part of my remarks. That would begin with the words "Oppression of the Negroes," in column 5 of page 6 of the Daily Worker of Saturday, May 26, 1928, and would extend over into column 6, down to the heading "The foreign-born workers."

There being no objection, the portion of the article referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPPRESSION OF THE NEGROES

American white imperialism oppresses in the most terrific way the 10,000,000 Negroes who constitute not less than one-tenth of the total population. White capitalist prejudice considers the Negroes as a lower race, as the born servants of the lofty white masters. The racial caste sytem is a fundamental feature of the social, industrial and political organization of this country. The Communist Party declares that it considers

itself not only the party of the working class but also the champion of the Negroes as an oppressed race and especially the organizer of the Negro working-class elements. The Communist Party is the party of the liberation of the Negro race from all white oppression.

There is a "new Negro" in process of development. The social composition of the Negro race is changing. Formerly the Negro was the cotton farmer in the South and domestic help in the North. The industrialization of the South, the concentration of a new Negro working class population in the big cities of the East and North, and the entrance of the Negroes into the basic industries on a mass scale have changed the whole social composition of the Negro race. The appearance of a genuine Negro industrial proletariat creates an organizing force for the whole Negro race; furnishes a new working class leadership to all Negro race movements, and strengthens immensely the fighting possibilities for the emancipation of the race.

The Negro tenant and share farmers of the South are still, despite all the pompous phrases about freeing the slaves, in the status of virtual slavery. They have not the slightest prospect of ever acquiring possession of the land on which they work. By means of an usurious credit system they are chained to the plantation owners as securely as chattel slaves. Peonage and contract labor are the fate of the Negro cotton farmer. The landowners, who are at the same time the merchants and the government of the South, rule over the Negroes with a merciless dictatorship.

There is the most dishonest and disgraceful "gentlemen's agreement" between the two capitalist parties against the political rights of the Negroes. The famous fourteenth and fifteenth amendments of the Constitution amount but to a scrap of paper. They were never carried out for a moment. The Supreme Court has upheld all State laws which disfranchised the Negroes. Sheer force prevents the Negro from exercising his so-called political rights. The Federal Government has never made any attempt to reduce the representation of those Southern States which violate the Constitution, as section 2 of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution provides. The Republican Party, the party of Lincoln, has sunk so low that it has provided for measures to segregate the Negro delegates to its 1928 Kansas City nominating convention. Lynch law is the hold over the Negroes. The terror of the Ku Klux Klan is the constitution for the Negroes. They are burned alive, whipped to death, hunted to death with dogs in the name of white civilization.

There is a general segregation policy against the Negro race. Separate residential sections; Jim Crow cars; separate schools for Negro children; exclusion from white hotels, restaurants, theaters, and railway waiting rooms; exclusion of Negroes from juries which try Negroes. Negro teachers cannot teach in white schools. The white masters try to reduce the Negroes to illiteracy. According to the 1920 white census, there were 4 percent illiterates among the whites and 22.9 percent among the Negroes. The Southern States spend hardly any money for the education of Negro children, but provide lavishly for the education of the children of the white.

In the cotton States the Negro farmers live in shacks together with their animals. In the cities the Negroes do the unskilled, the most disagreeable, most hazardous work and are crowded into the worst sections of the city. The death rate of the Negroes is much higher than that of the whites. In 1925 it was 11.1 per thousand for the whites and 18.2 for the Negroes.

The southern plantation owners and their government have tried to keep the Negro farmers and agricultural workers in the southern cotton fields by force. But even their brutal terror has not been able to check the mighty migration from these cotton plantations to the industrial centers of the Northern and Eastern States. This migration is an unarmed, Spartacan uprising against slavery and oppression by a capitalist and feudal oligarchy.

The Negro fled from the South, but what has he found in the North? He has found in the company towns and industrial cities of the North and East a wage slavery no better than the contract labor in the South. He has found crowded, unsanitary slums. He has exchanged the old segregation for a new segregation. He is doing the most dangerous, worst-paid work in the steel, coal, and packing industries. He has found the racial prejudices of a narrow, white labor aristocracy, which refuses to recognize the unskilled Negro worker as its equal. He has found the treachery of the bureaucracy of the A. F. of L. which refuses to organize the Negroes into trade unions. The lynchings of the South are replaced by the race riots of the East. The employing class tries to arouse the racial hatred and prejudice of the white workers against the Negro workers with the sinister aim to split and divide the ranks of the working class.

The Communist Party considers it as its historic duty to unite all workers regardless of their color against the common enemy, against the master class. The Negro race must understand that capitalism means racial oppression and communism means social and racial equality.

DEMANDS

1. Abolition of the whole system of race discrimination. Full racial equality.

2. Abolition of all laws which result in segregation of Negroes. Abolition of all Jim Crow laws. The law shall forbid all discrimination against Negroes in selling or renting houses.

3. Abolition of all laws which disenfranchise the Negroes on the ground of color.

4. Abolition of laws forbidding inter-marriage of persons of different races.

5. Abolition of all laws and public administration measures which prohibit, or in practice prevent, Negro children or youth from attending general public schools or universities.

6. Full and equal admittance of Negroes to all railway station waiting rooms, restaurants, hotels, and theaters.

7. The War and Navy Departments of the United States Government should abolish all Jim Crow distinctions in the Army and Navy.

8. Immediate removal of all restrictions in all trade unions against the membership of Negro workers.

9. Equal opportunity for employment, wages, hours, and working conditions for Negro and white workers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I merely want to read the ninth demand in that platform—that platform which covers almost every conceivable demand that the ultra left people have been making in this field—and which is said by Mr. Krock and which is reported by investigators to be the fountainhead and source, the suggestive source from which FEPC planks have since come, and from which FEPC programs have been evolved and suggested to States, and now finally have come on the agenda of the National Congress. That plank, No. 9, under the heading "Demands" reads simply as follows:

Equal opportunity for employment, wages, hours, and working conditions for Negro and white workers.

Mr. President, Mr. Krock says the investigators and research men say it seems to be definitely established that that is the source from which FEPC legislation has grown.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to complete this part of my talk, then I will yield. That does not mean necessarily that the particular program would have to be bad, simply because the Communists suggested it, but it means that it comes from their philosophy, that they claim paternity, as they have repeatedly, in the Daily Worker, that that paternity is recognized by such writers as Mr. Arthur Krock, that paternity was recognized by the California Committee on Un-American Activities of the California Legislature, and that, following that declaration, Communists generally have been active in the promotion of FEPC, just as was shown in the case of the California activity, that over 30 of the active members of 63 on the committee there which was sponsoring FEPC as a constitutional measure were themselves Communists and in the communistic effort.

That does not at all mean that everyone who has sponsored FEPC or who is now sponsoring FEPC has the remotest idea of supporting anything which is communistic. It does not mean at all that the Senator from Florida is charging that everyone who is supporting FEPC is communistic; quite the contrary.

Let me make this very clear. This whole program that is related in that part of the Communist platform which has already been placed in the RECORD, radicalism of the worst sort, has the earmarks of destructive effort, which will make itself felt in every part of the Nation and upon every part of our United States Government, both at the Federal level and at the State and local levels, and we might as well know, when we are seriously considering bringing up such legislation as this, this is the source from which it comes. Not only does it come from that source, but it has had active lip service and active foot service from that source ever since it sprung full-formed from Communist brains back in 1928.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should merely like to invite the Senator's attention to a statement—and I shall pose it in the form of a question—since the Senator is referring to the source of the idea of FEPC. On page 5 of the report of the bill, S. 1728, at the middle of the page, there is a statement by the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, bishop of Grand Rapids, a noted Catholic clergyman, who, in a letter in 1947 to the chairman of the committee that was holding hearings on FEPC, said:

I earnestly hope that this bill will become law.

I offer no lengthy comment on the underlying principle of the bill; that is, that all American citizens are equal, and that all are entitled to have their right to equal opportunity protected by law. To me both as an American citizen and as a Catholic bishop

this principle needs no supporting argument. Equality is among our most treasured American possessions, as it is a central doctrine of Christian faith, which proclaims that all men are equal before God, made equal before Him through His Divine Son, Jesus Christ.

May I refer also to the Senator with a request for his comment the remark of the Catholic bishop, the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago, who said:

I conclude by stating that in Paul's letter to the Corinthians he said:

"Ye are neither Jews nor Gentiles, neither bond nor free: Ye are all one in Jesus Christ our Lord."

I ask the Senator what does he really think is the source of FEPC, in the face of the testimony of Bishop Haas, Bishop Sheil, and the beloved and late lamented Monsignor Ryan, who said:

The Christian precept of brotherly love is not satisfied by mere well-wishing, nor benevolent emotion nor sentimental yearning. It requires action.

I wish the Senator from Florida would give me his observations. Is FEPC equality of treatment, a fundamental part of the Christian doctrine, or is it a Communist-inspired doctrine? I think an answer should be forthcoming.

Mr. HOLLAND. The answer will be forthcoming, and at once. There is no doubt in the world that this proposal for the creation of a governmental agency to engraft upon our Government the principle that men have to be hired or fired, depending upon religion and religious beliefs, race and racial beliefs, or color, comes from Communist inspiration. There is not the slightest question of it. The Senator from Minnesota will find no ground for any other conclusion.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall not yield at this time. I prefer to continue in my own way.

There is an equality before the law, and then there is an equality, spiritually and morally, of which the Senator is talking. Certainly no one questions the equality of all men as brethren, and, according to our concept, as sons of God. I should be the last to deny that. But to say, in the next breath, that that means every employer has to give his concern to the question of whether his employees are gentiles or Jews, Roman Catholics, or Protestants, white or colored, to apportion his representation amongst his employees on that basis, and that there shall be compulsion to see that he does so—there is no such thing as that in Holy Writ or in Christine doctrine, and anyone who would pretend that such is the case would be on unsound ground. I remind the distinguished Senator that a much wiser brain than mine, and much more devoted lips spoke with authority that has never been seriously questioned—

Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's.

I must remind the Senator that he is dealing with values which have nothing to do with governmental practice. When he comes to the field of thought control, of dictation to an individual, to tell him that he cannot choose the person he thinks is the best qualified to perform the service for which he will pay, we get into an ideology far, far from the American democratic principle.

Mr. President, I find no support whatever for any other ascribable source for the suggestion that FEPC be created as a governmental agency to itself and to force and engraft upon men's minds, both employers and employees, this thing which is called antidiscrimination in the field of employment. That comes from communism; it has been suggested by Communists. Persons who have gone into the subject much more deeply than has the Senator from Minnesota or as has the Senator from Florida have come up with that conclusion. I do not think it is worthy of further debate, because it is a fact that it was suggested by communism.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I cannot yield at this time.

The mere fact that communism suggests it, does not blast it, but it is part of a general disruptive scheme which is designed to tear down good will and sound relations among our people, on racial lines, and every other conceivable line. The distinguished Senator from Minnesota cannot possibly read promulgations in the entire plan of the Communist platform of 1928, which has been adhered to so closely since that time, without coming to the conclusion, to which able men and women who have made a life-long study of it have come, that communism is seeking to destroy us. It is seeking to tear us down.

As stated in the report of the California Committee on Un-American Activities, it made a deliberate effort to tear down and to rend apart a fine State government. I invite the Senator's attention to the fact that since the issuance of that report California has not even given serious consideration to any further suggestion of FEPC legislation. The Senator was not present when we discussed that this afternoon, which I regret, and I shall repeat only this much of it, that it was stated by the Senator from Florida that there was not any broader electorate than that of California, where there is no poll-tax requirement, and there were 2,250,000 persons voting. They were persons who had come from every section of the Nation, who had always been dominantly progressive, not reactionary. They knocked it down before they had the report of the Un-American Affairs Committee of the California Legislature, by a vote of 2½ to 1, with 2,250,000 persons voting.

Maybe the Senator has an answer for that. I remember his answer in connection with the knocking-down of FEPC legislation by legislatures, as a State matter. His answer was that legislatures were not properly representative of American thinking, with which I disagree entirely. But I have not yet heard any answer from the distinguished Senator, which I hope he will give us in his own good time, and on his own time, as to why the people of California, in the expression of their sovereign will and in one of the most widely participated in elections they have ever had, gave such a blasting repulse to the suggestion that they turn over their State government to an ideology as foreign, as destructive, and as disruptive as they found the Communist-inspired FEPC scheme to be.

Mr. President, I had intended——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will allow me to conclude, I shall be happy to yield for further questions at the conclusion of my remarks.

I had intended to go into a completely different field, the South, because, up to this time, except for some questions or colloquies, I have confined myself to what happened outside the South. It is true that whereas 8 States have approved FEPC, 19 States have rejected and knocked it down. Those States have a population more than twice as great as have the States which adopted it. It is true that 21 States have not regarded it as of sufficient value even to consider it in their legislatures. It is true that between one-fourth and one-fifth of the people of this Nation live under FEPC laws, a very large proportion have rejected it, and the rest have regarded it as so unsound that they do not want it. They have done more than reject it; they have refused to regard it as something they would like to have engrafted upon their form of government.

Mr. President, to refer to the South, I was going to dwell at some length upon the record in the South and our deep conviction that the adoption of any such unsound program will cause great trouble in an area of the Nation in which there has not been as much violence as there has been outside the South, where there is much greater educational opportunity, in the main, for our Negroes than is to be found in other places, where, as was shown in the debate last year on the question of the southern regional educational program, people in other States are having to send their young Negroes to two Negro schools for dental and medical training. One of the schools is Howard University, in Washington, D. C., and the other is Meharry, in Nashville, Tenn.

In the case of the University of Pennsylvania, it at one time, when I was speaking in Philadelphia in 1948, had one Negro enrolled in all four classes of their great medical school. At the same time about 25 colored citizens of Pennsylvania were enrolled and were taking medical training at Howard University or at Meharry. It is an inescapable fact that our system has brought and is bringing better results. Even though the door of opportunity may be open in that part of the Nation where segregation does not exist, it is practically closed by the fact that the competition is too severe.

I have in my file a letter from the dean of one of the great California medical schools, stating that they would like to have Negro youths there. They wanted them to apply and take the examinations. However, competition had been too severe and they had not been able to make the grade. He even suggested that Meharry or Howard be kind enough to send over two or three of their best young people. They said they would welcome them. The fact was that they

were not helping to solve the problems of the Negro people, simply because the organization of their educational system was not such as to give them any opportunity. They are getting an opportunity in the South. It is irrefutable that they are getting it. The Senators who are present know that is true. They are getting the opportunity in the field of education in the South. Negro professional people in education have an opportunity which is withheld or denied in other parts of the Nation. Mr. President, there is no use for us to smile about that and say, "Well, that is a small situation, and that does not count much." I say that the solution of this problem must largely come from within the minority. It must come from the leadership and the devoted service of people from within those minority groups. We want to help them. We have helped them, and we shall continue to do all we can in greater and greater measure. After all, their rights will be determined by the kind of leadership they have and how that leadership exerts itself in training their youth. I call attention again to the fact that in the South 7 Negroes out of every 1,000 in our area are professional teachers, as compared with—and these are Library of Congress figures—only 1 out of every 1,000 Negroes in all the rest of the Nation, taken together as a group.

Mr. President, that is not the whole difference. In the South we have a large number of colored college presidents, deans, and principals of schools. It is a situation which cannot exist as such in other parts of the country. At the time the study was made there was not a single Negro college president outside the South. In the South we are giving that opportunity, and we are glad to see it avidly contended for and avidly used. It is the expression of devoted lives of people of that color, who think they see a chance to raise their own people to a higher standard of living and culture. They are people who have devoted their lives to that end. Negroes have no such opportunity in the nonsegregated schools in the North, East, and West.

I have already spoken of violence. We are making a better record in the South than elsewhere, in many, many fields. We are doing a much better job than is being done in other parts of the Nation. We want to continue doing that job. We are doing it to the best of our opportunity, advantage, training, and devotion. I have in mind something else which people in other parts of the Nation do not understand. That is good will. It is the good will which exists between the colored citizens of the South and the white people of the South. It is a real factor. It exists on a very great scale. It is responsible for the major part of the program of advancement which now exists. Senators may not recall, but the junior Senator from Florida recently put into the RECORD the Record of Achievement—and that is what it is—of the Southern Regional Commission on Higher Education, which has gone so far already without the help of an approving resolution in the Senate and without the chance of building up new capital structures which could be built only with heavy appropriations, which of course would not be given so long as there exists the question of legality. So far as the establishment of facilities and the distribution of those facilities are concerned, we are doing a fine job, and I am proud of it. It is not only the South which is proud of the job we are doing. Educators and other public officials all over the United States recognize that fact as outstanding. If the record is examined, it will be found that Negro boys and girls are getting a large part of the help. While their population is only a third of ours, the number of colored youth who are being helped is exactly equal to the number of white youth. In other words, in going to medical schools from a State such as mine which has no medical college, in going to dental schools from a State such as mine which has no dental schools, or in going to a veterinary school from a State such as mine which has no schools in that field, we are finding opportunity and giving opportunity to youths of both colors which they could not get otherwise. We are proud of the job we are doing. We are doing it in the name of humanity, essential Christianity, and religion, of which my friend from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] was speaking a while ago. We believe in equality of opportunity. We do not believe equality of opportunity is expressed by a law which says to an employer, "You must do so and so, simply because it violates a rule of distribution of your employees among certain religious and racial groups."

Mr. President, the reason I cannot go into the southern field fully this afternoon is obvious. It is too late to do so. Before I leave this point, however, I want to make it clear that at some subsequent date in the debate I hope to come back to this field. The reason I wish to do so is because it is made crystal clear in this debate, by the report, by the report of the President's Civil Rights Commission, and by the messages of the President himself, that we are not talking about an isolated problem. We are not talking about FEPC standing by itself. We are talking about a general problem which goes much further than any person who has any grasp of its background wants to go.

I should like to quote from a speech made on the floor of the Senate by the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] on Tuesday, May 9, as follows:

> The point in my program, Mr. President, is that we should now pass this bill—

He is speaking of the FEPC bill—

> and let us then enact every phase of the President's civil-rights program. Let us erase every stain of racial discrimination and segregation from our statute books. Let us accelerate the progress already made in barring discrimination and segregation from our educational system—

What a tragedy it would be to the Negro people if that course were followed through—

> our housing—

What a tragedy it would be to the Negro people if that course were followed. Most public-housing units in the South have to do with housing for Negro people. If these short-sighted people on the floor of the Senate and the floor of the House had been successful in their insistent proposals from time to time that no educational money should go from Federal sources to an educational institution which operated on a segregation basis, or for housing except on a basis of joint use of housing by both colored and white people, the colored people in our country would have been the ones who would have sustained grievous if not irreparable loss. That would have happened if the short-sighted policy had been adopted.

> Let us accelerate the progress already made in barring discrimination and segregation from our educational system, our housing, our civilian government, and our military forces.

I do not indulge the hope that any Senator will remember an incident which I related last year when we were debating a somewhat similar issue on the floor of the Senate. I related a true incident which had occurred in my home town when a group of Negroes came to see me. They made it clear that under no circumstances did they want legislation passed which is contained in the civil-rights program, in the President's proposal, and in the agitation in this whole field, which would require that men in uniform be given access to all places of public accommodation and amusement, such as hotels, restaurants, dance halls, pool rooms, bowling alleys, and other places of that nature. I had thought of it from the point of view that perhaps Negroes in the military forces, because of some circumstance, might try to trespass upon customs and law of communities in which they were serving. On the contrary, what these Negroes feared was that white youths to whom they properly referred, I think, as white trash, might come over into their quarter of the town and, perhaps, infused with a little too much alcohol, might force their way into Negro dance halls, restaurants, hotels, and other places, where young colored people were being entertained, with the result that there might be racial friction and perhaps serious trouble.

Then they came to the point, as they said to me, "Judge, don't you know that if that sort of thing happens the people who will suffer the most will be the colored people whose homes are here, and who ask nothing better than to be left alone, in our living and our progress, getting better conditions for ourselves and our children and grandchildren?" An old grandfather was the one who uttered that to me, and it made a profound impression. Yet here is a good Senator, led by good motives, of course, offering to do away with all discrimination and segregation affecting the members of the armed forces; and that is a definite part of the recommendation of the Civil Rights Committee and of the President himself.

Mr. President, the trouble is there is too much lack of information about the real implications of this program, and the real problem we are talking about and trying to solve, not by legislation, because it is not soluble by legislation,

but instead by working things out gently and kindly, with understanding and sympathy, and with reciprocal courtesy, each race and each religion having that attitude toward the others.

Mr. President, I know something about these problems. Every man who has been Governor of a Southern State knows about them, and I see sitting in the seat of the minority leader the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL], who served as Governor of his State, and I am sure this same problem is still present in his State.

It is by observing tolerance and mutual good will that a solution of these problems will finally come. We are reaching that point rapidly. We are proceeding at a tremendous pace, and will reach a solution of the problem if we are just allowed to bring it to its natural conclusion through the methods which we are following effectively, and with great success.

Mr. President, I am sorry I have not had time to go adequately into the question of what the threat of this legislation means to the South. The South does have a great stake in the problem. It would be idle to deny it, and I would not deny it. So far as I am concerned, I am activated not only by the existence of the problem in the South but by the existence of the problem generally throughout the Nation. Certainly the problem affects the South more than any other part of the Nation. People who are fair, like the New Jersey Negro editor who came South a while back and studied conditions, or like the committee of students from Massachusetts who came down and studied the situation, or like similar investigators, find peace and quietude and mutual understanding and prosperity existing, and marvel at it, and go back and say they did not think such conditions existed, because they were used to hearing of bitterness as prevailing everywhere in the South.

Mr. President, I hope to speak at some length on this subject at a later stage in the debate, but I did not want to ignore it at this time. I felt impelled to refer to it because the Senator from Connecticut has gone into the subject matter, because of the fact that the Civil Rights Commission goes into it so exhaustively, the fact that the President referred to it so fully, the fact that the platforms of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party went into it. In the case of the Democratic platform, the plank was adopted by only a small vote, and, as I pointed out earlier in the day, the change of the vote of New Jersey, of Massachusetts, of New York, of Illinois, of Michigan, or of any one of several other States, would have changed the result.

Mr. President, the fact that those things exist means that we know this is not an isolated program standing by itself, but is part of a general program aimed at breaking down segregation, aimed at breaking down social admixture—I like that term better than "social equality." I recall that when the Senator from Minnesota testified before a House committee he stated he believed in social equality. I respect his views, but I do not think he had the understanding of the problem that would come from living with it for many years.

We know that these other things are in this picture. We know, in the case of the minority groups that are driving all the time for the enactment of the program, that they are not thinking of FEPC in terms of an isolated act, but of all the acts that have been suggested. They are thinking of social admixture.

Throughout the South we were terribly disturbed in the last year when it appeared so clearly that the two principal Negro leaders of NAACP had that in their minds, because both of them, after their Negro wives were divorced, married white women. It is not for me to comment as to whether that is sound leadership or unsound, safe or unsafe, false or good, but the point I make is that the people of the South know that the preservation of racial purity on both sides, the white stock on the one and the colored stock on the other, is fully involved in this argument. Both our white and our Negro people violently oppose mixed marriage. We know from the very attitude and performance of leaders in this field that that is one of the things they are thinking about.

We do not have to be told that something is wrong when we see the Negro leaders in some parts of the Nation—and I glory in the fact that there are only a few—go off after communism. We do not have to be told things are going badly when men appear and testify against their sons making themselves available for the military service of the Nation. We know that does not speak the sentiments of the Negro people, because the Negro people are a patriotic people, and they have proved repeatedly their patriotism, and that they are willing to die for their country. But we know, when those things are manifested day after day, when we see them and know them and hear about them, that they are really a part of the program. All that is in the sorry picture—miscegenation, social equality, a turn to communism by some Negro individuals who had most to be grateful for, because as American citizens, they were given the chance to attain to greatness. I am thinking of the case of the singer Robeson, of the real greatness of the stature he had attained as an artist and the pleasure of all our people at his performance in his chosen field of music, in which he had such great talent. But he strayed away to communism.

Knowing that these things are in the picture, we must be most deeply concerned, particularly when we see good friends of ours from other parts of the Nation who do not have the problem present in their own sections not troubled about it; particularly when we see a situation coming up in which, after 19 States have knocked down FEPC efforts, not a Senator from any of those States rises to explain the position of his people, to explain why his people took the action they did take, based on their deep convictions.

It begins to be apparent that the force and the pressure of the minority groups have prevailed in places where they should not have prevailed, and I deeply deplore of that thing happening in free America, where we think that all people of all classes and creeds have stood together and should continue to do so.

I have spoken already of the moderate program by which we are willing to approach this series of problems. We are willing to go more than half way in the effort to find a sane solution.

I ask Senators never to get the idea that we who view this matter as a vital problem, as a vital threat to the dearest things we have, in our families, in our States, in our communities, in our schools, in our churches, all through the South, are going to yield on this question, which we think so terribly destructive of a way of life under which happiness prevails, and under which kindness is being done by each group to the other, and I know great progress is being made by following the American pattern laid down a long time ago by our wise forefathers, a pattern which we are certainly willing to continue to follow and to preserve for those who will come after us.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

FLOOD CONDITIONS IN MANITOBA

During the delivery of Mr. HOLLAND'S speech,

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the distinguished Senator from Florida permit me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOLLAND. By unanimous consent, I yield for that purpose.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to take any time from the distinguished Senator from Florida. However, I should like very much to have unanimous consent to make a statement, and I ask that my remarks may appear at the conclusion of the distinguished Senator's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the serious flood conditions in Manitoba, Canada. We have had serious flood conditions in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and in my own State of Nebraska. The Red River at Winnipeg has reached a height of 30.1 feet. It is 12.1 feet above the level of the river bank.

The principal urgency at this moment is the holding of the dikes, which are being manned by 50,000 civilian volunteers and 5,000 soldiers. The flooded area at Winnipeg comprises 8 square miles, with refugees numbering between 82,000 to 100,000 persons, most of whom have been evacuated from Winnipeg.

In addition the river has flooded 10 towns south of Winnipeg, inundating 3,000 homes in the 600 square mile farm area. This valley is rich grain and cattle-raising land. Ten thousand persons have been forced out of the farm area in addition to the refugees out of Winnipeg. The river has a 30-mile current at this moment and this force, plus winds, is beating against the dikes. The crucial point in the minds of Canadian officials is whether or not the dikes can hold. Evidence of weakening is shown

across the river from Winnipeg, at St. Boniface, which stands a chance of being under 12 feet of water momentarily. Canadian officials say it is impossible to estimate damage or the extent of the evacuation.

The Canadian Government is organizing an airlift capable of taking out 9,000 persons a day from the area. Evacuees are presently being taken to the nearest centers in neighboring provinces. Those who can are staying with friends and relatives. The Canadian Army and the Canadian Red Cross are faced with the job of housing and feeding the rest.

Mr. President, I have been reliably informed that the American Red Cross has sent observers into the particular area affected, and they have been told to stand by. They have offered all the relief possible, which, of course, will take care of the need for food. But momentarily there is danger of disease breaking out and hunger coming upon the people. This is one of the most devastating disasters in the history of Canada.

Mr. President, we have extended aid to many countries, and it seems to me that a neighbor and friend like Canada should at least have our moral and our spiritual assistance at this particular time. I have drafted a concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have read. If it shall result in any debate, I shall withdraw it. It merely provides that the President shall make available the appropriate agencies of the United States to assure Canada immediately that we stand ready to render aid in case of need.

I had particularly in mind the airlift, and the effort to help to get the evacuees out of the stricken area. It seems to me this would be not only a gesture of good will, but it would lend Canada moral and spiritual support which a neighboring country should extend at such a time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest that it would be possible to help evacuate those who must leave Winnipeg by the use of the United States Air Force. I am sure we have plenty of planes, even in that vicinity, which could aid in taking the people to proper shelters, and if they need food, our Government agencies will be able to supply it, and our medical services may lend aid to the people who need it.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his observations. My thought was that if any of the agencies knew that it was the sense of the Congress, that such aid should be granted according to law, so that no law was violated, and under the direction of the President, it might be the sensible, the charitable, and the neighborly thing to do under the circumstances.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Senator asked for unanimous consent? Time is of the essence. The flood is now raging.

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senate does not mind, I should like to have the resolution read, and then I shall ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. It is a concurrent resolution, so that if it could be adopted by the Senate tonight, it could go to the House immediately.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I visited the stricken area of the Northwest, and saw the devastating flood in the making. It was then in the area of Crookston and East Grand Forks and other towns north toward the Canadian border. We knew it was going to strike into Canada, because of the enormous amount of water that was in the area where I visited. I fully appreciate the situation which confronts the people of Winnipeg and the Canadian Government.

I should like also to call attention to the terrific losses suffered by communities in northwest Minnesota and northeast North Dakota as a result of the flood. At this time we do not know of all the loss and damage suffered by those communities because of the flood, but I think this legislative body should take speedy action on appropriation measures to assist in financing the losses the communities have sustained.

I commend the Senator from Nebraska for offering the concurrent resolution. It is a neighborly action, and I hope the concurrent resolution may be acted on speedily.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILEY. I join with those who have spoken in relation to the subject raised by the Senator from Nebraska. In this world of many conflicting affairs, when catastrophe strikes, as it does, either in any of our States or anywhere on earth, the heart of America responds.

I commend the distinguished minority leader for sensing the situation brought on by the flood, which gives an opportunity to express our sincere sympathy, but more than that, our sincere intent to afford such help as is possible, spiritual and moral and financial, as the Senator says, to our neighbors to the north. After all, the Canadians are our kinfolk. There is probably no other nation nearer to us than the great people of Canada, who have done so well. I am very happy to join in the sentiments expressed by the minority leader.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask that the concurrent resolution be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the resolution.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 89) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that the President should direct the appropriate agencies of the United States to make available immediately the fullest aid consistent with law to the appropriate agencies of the Dominion of Canada in order that the facilities and resources of the United States may assist the Dominion of Canada in giving aid and relief to those suffering as a result of the recent disastrous floods in the Province of Manitoba, and especially in the city of Winnipeg. The physical, financial, and moral support of the United States should be extended to the Canadian people in their hour of need not alone as an act of mercy, but as a natural and fitting expression of the historic friendship and kinship of the peoples of the United States and of Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I do not know anything about the concurrent resolution. I ask the Senator from Nebraska whether the Canadian Government has been asking for assistance.

Mr. WHERRY. No; I have not taken it up with the Canadian Government. My theory was that one spot particularly affected was Winnipeg. The morning newspapers indicate that 100,000 people have been evacuated. The reports show that 9,000 people are being taken out of that city every day by airplane. I did verify with the Canadian Embassy most of the observations I made relative to the situation.

I am not sure there is much that can be done, so I drafted the concurrent resolution to indicate that it was the sense of the Congress that the President should look into the matter and advise the Government facilities which are available, and extend such aid, if any, as could be extended to the Province of Manitoba, and especially, the city of Winnipeg. My thought was that this was a time to show our moral and financial support to a neighboring country like Canada. Whether or not they would use the aid which might be available would be a matter for later consideration. I do know that the American Red Cross has sent observers to Canada, and they have offered their assistance to relieve human suffering. The Canadian Red Cross has given assurance that they would call upon the American Red Cross if they needed their aid.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, it is somewhat unusual for the Congress of the United States to direct the President to start aiding another country financially when there has been no request for such aid. If the time comes when we can do anything to assist those who are suffering from the flood, we should give what help we can. But I do not believe this is the proper time to proceed. I do not believe we should proceed unless there is a direct demand or cry for help from the people in the afflicted area of Canada. The Canadian Government is in pretty good shape. I have heard speeches made on the floor of the Senate condemning our own Government for its fiscal policy, and comparing our fiscal situation unfavorably with that of Canada. Until I know a little more about the situation I shall object to immediate consideration of a concurrent resolution of this kind. I regret that it was taken up in my absence, without an attempt being made to bring it up after a quorum had been called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the concurrent resolution will lie over under the rule.

FEDERAL FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the motion of Mr. LUCAS to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 1728)

to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier in the day I said to the Senator from Florida that in view of the fact that he had brought into his discussion and his debate a series of arguments in reference to my participation in the radio discussion on the American Forum of the Air, I desired to make an appropriate reply. While I realize the lateness of the hour, Mr. President, I also realize the seriousness of the decision we are about to make on the pending question.

I must confess that it is rather difficult for me to listen to what I consider to be a complete distortion of the purpose of the legislation. When I say "complete distortion," that can be documented, as it shall be, once the measure is on the floor as a measure for debate and for discussion, where we can vote on the measure, and not vote upon a parliamentary question of whether we should consider the measure.

The Senator from Florida has referred to FEPC legislation saying to employers "You must hire a certain number of people of Jewish faith, a certain number of Protestant faith, a certain number of Catholic faith, a certain number of the Negro race or the Chinese race, or some other race." That is a complete distortion of what the legislation stands for, because the legislation says just one thing, that in the matter of employment there shall be no discrimination because of a man's race, his color, his national origin, or his religion. In other words, what the Senator has said is completely the opposite of the purpose of the bill. It is about time the record was appropriately set straight, because this is legislation to provide that persons shall have the right of freedom of association on the basis of their skill, their talent, their ability, and not be denied the freedom of association because of such false standards as may be established by the prejudices of mankind.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder if the Senator has seen the only decision we have been able to find coming out of any of the FEPC commissions. It is not a court decision, but a decision of the commission of the State of Connecticut, a 1950 decision, in the case of Oscar S. Draper against Clark Dairy, Inc. Has the Senator from Minnesota seen it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I have not.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wish the Senator would yield long enough for me to read the headlines into the RECORD. Then the Senator may have the whole file if he wishes for use in later debate by him.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator from Florida that we are not discussing Connecticut legislation. We are discussing Senate bill 1728. The Senator from Minnesota has read the bill not once, but many, many times, and is familiar with every paragraph, every sentence, every word, every semicolon, and every comma in it. I submit that there is not one word in the legislation which substantiates the arguments made today as to the purposes of the bill.

I yield to the Senator from Florida to make the insertion he requested.

Mr. HOLLAND. I read as follows:

Connecticut (1950).

Oscar S. Draper v. *Clark Dairy, Inc.*

Finding of fact, opinion, and cease and desist order of hearing tribunal of hearing examiners appointed by chairman of Connecticut Interracial Commission. Complaint No. FEP 120, March 8, 1950.

Connecticut Fair Employment Practice Act—unfair employment practice—discrimination in employment because of race—employer ordered to hire Negro.

Mr. President, the whole decision is too long to read, but I wanted to put that much in the RECORD.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I will be very happy to have the file of the case so I may study it. I may say that if the decision is as it was stated, it is to be commended, because the purpose of the legislation is to do away with the false standards of discrimination and to permit persons to be employed on the basis of their skill, their ability, and their talent, which is thoroughly within the American tradition. And I shall say at a later time in my debate, not tonight, but at a later time, and with full documentation, that the purposes of the bill are within the tradition of all the spiritual and philosophical tenets of the American way of life.

Mr. President, I have listened to one other argument on which I wish to make a brief comment. The argument is that somehow or other we are catering to minorities. The time has come for plain speech. The only group that seems to be catering to a minority today is the United States Senate. We are catering to a minority of persons who are unwilling even to permit a measure to come up to be voted upon. It appears to me that the minority is here in the Senate, not out in the country. I want that to be clearly understood as being my position.

I have heard arguments made today that it would be wonderful if we could remain in session and debate the legislation on through. The majority leader was helped in a colloquy by members of the minority side of the aisle who said how wonderful it would be, how they would love to join with the majority leader to stay and fight the issue through to the bitter end. Would that we had had that same kind of concern and consideration when we voted upon the change of the rules, which require 64 votes for the Senate to stop unlimited debate on even a motion to bring up a bill, much less to vote on passage of the bill. The American people do not understand this nonsense. They think we are debating FEPC. Here we are debating whether or not we are going to talk about FEPC, and we have been talking about it for 10 days. Is it any wonder that sometimes people lose faith in democratic procedures?

May I make particular reference to the comment which was made pertaining to the hearings, because I want this to go into the RECORD. I have watched the crocodile tears as they have been shed, and have heard the pious statements about the fact that there were no hearings held on the FEPC bill. The question is asked, How can we consider a measure of such momentous importance as FEPC without hearings?

How did Senators who ask such questions happen to vote on the bill to provide Federal aid to education this year, which was passed by a vote of 58 to 15, without any hearings in the Eighty-first Congress having been held on the subject of Federal aid to education? The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare had held no hearings on Federal aid to education. I have in my hand the record vote of every Senator on that subject. Those who protested the loudest about the fact that we have had no hearings in the Eighty-first Congress respecting FEPC, and therefore we must not consider the bill as such, would be violating parliamentary traditions, voted the loudest and made the greatest noise in connection with Federal aid to education. Yes, they voted for a bill on which not 1 day of hearing was held in the Eighty-first Congress.

How many of the Senators on this floor voted for the school health services bill? That is a measure which is going to inject the Federal Government into every schoolroom in America.

I have heard much comment over what terrible things will result from enactment of the FEPC legislation. Yet not a Senator rose to his feet and said that we ought to have hearings on the school health services bill.

How about the hearings in the Eighty-first Congress on the National Science Foundation bill? Were there any hearings? No. When were the hearings held? In the Eightieth Congress. Were they accepted in the Eighty-first Congress? They were.

We have had hearings on the FEPC bill in the Seventy-seventh, the Seventy-ninth, the Eightieth, and the Eighty-first Congresses. But we have had many speeches in the Senate in which Senators have told what a terrible thing we will be doing if we take up the FEPC bill. If we did so, we would shake the foundations of the Republic. No hearings have been held. That is nothing more or less than a parliamentary move.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. DONNELL. The question is merely for information. Is the Senator correct in his statement that there were hearings held in the Eighty-first Congress on the FEPC bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes, in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DONNELL. None were held in the Senate committee, though.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, but the House of Representatives is a coordinate body in the legislative branch of the Government, and any Senator who wanted to be heard could have been heard. The same witnesses testify before the House committee who testified before the Senate committee. I only wish to say that the committees went a little bit further in the Eighty-first Congress in respect to the FEPC legislation than they did in respect to the National Science Foundation or the school health services bill.

The Senator from Minnesota wishes to say that he does not see why some Senators are so alarmed all at once by reason of lack of hearings respecting the FEPC legislation. We have this kind of distortion, this kind of legislative trickery going on here respecting this important piece of legislation. That is done in an effort to do what? To prevent the Senate even having a chance to vote on one of the most controversial issues of our day. I submit that that shows lack of faith. It represents an unwillingness to test the courage of the respective Members of the United States Senate to see how they are going to vote. Are we going to settle the issue on the basis of a trick parliamentary maneuver—on a motion to consider the bill?

Mr. President, the Senate has considered the ECA bill and the Senate has considered one bill after another pertaining to the defense of this country. The Senate considered the bill for Federal aid to education and bills pertaining to Federal aid to hospitals and medical schools. The Senate has considered bills on almost every conceivable legislative proposal, without debating for one minute the question of whether to have the Senate proceed to consider those bills. In regard to such bills, the majority leader simply announced the bill, and most Members of the Senate left the floor and went back to their offices.

However, now when we come to the FEPC bill, we find that we have to have a delaying argument in regard to whether to have the Senate proceed to consider the bill. No Senator has given any reason against having the Senate consider the bill, except that some Senators do not like the bill. The only argument against having the Senate consider the bill is that some Senators do not like it.

I happen to be enough of a believer in the democratic process to say that if Senators do not like a bill, they should give their arguments and should register their votes, but should do so on the question of the bill itself, and should not resort to some sort of legislative trickery or some other legislative procedure, call it what we will, to prevent the measure from being acted upon.

Mr. President, let me speak now for a moment in regard to the kind of doctrine of association which has been advanced by some Senators. This sort of attack is an insult to our intelligence. The attack which was made today by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and the attack recently made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is an attack upon the integrity of the religious faiths in this country and the political institutions in this country.

Let me quote from an Associated Press dispatch regarding the remarks of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in the Senate:

WASHINGTON.—Senator RUSSELL, Democrat, Georgia, today launched a sizzling attack on the Fair Employment Practices Commission (FEPC) bill which administration forces are seeking to bring before the Senate for action.

RUSSELL, quarterback of the southern Democratic forces opposing the bill, charged an FEPC law would bring about nationalization of industry, and "follows the Russian idea" in that it would create "thought police" in the United States.

The bill would set up a commission to enforce nondiscrimination in employment.

"We will not defeat Russia in either the cold war or a shooting war by copying any part of the Russian system," RUSSELL told the Senate.

"I, of course, do not charge that all persons supporting this bill are Socialists or Communists. Many good Americans have been deceived. I do, however, unhesitatingly assert that every Socialist and every Communist in the United States, every person who believes in government ownership and operation of our industries, is ardently supporting this measure and all of its sanctions."

Mr. President, today the Senator from Florida has stated to the Senate that this proposed legislation is Communist-inspired, that the source of this legislation is the Communist Party.

However, to the contrary, I say that the source of this legislation is the Declaration of Independence, which says—

That all men are created equal.

And that—

Governments are instituted among men * * * to secure these rights * * * (of) life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. President, during the debate on this measure, when we get away from the present parliamentary maneuvering, I shall quote again, and at great length, from the report and from the hearings of the Senate committee in the Eightieth Congress and from the House committee hearings in the Eighty-first Congress and I shall recite the testimony of persons of importance who apparently have been influenced by the desirability of the enactment of FEPC legislation.

I mention first some of the great spiritual leaders who have testified in behalf of this legislation. I say it is sheer distortion and adulteration of the facts and the evidence to try to label this kind of legislation as Communist-inspired.

I happen to have known the late Msgr. John A. Ryan, one of the great Christian leaders of this Nation and of this century. He testified before the Senate committee in 1944—a great Catholic spiritual leader—in behalf of this legislation. He based his advocacy of this legislative proposal, not upon some political doctrine, but upon the moral doctrine of the Christian faith.

I also call the attention of those who are trying to muddy the waters and those who are trying to indulge in smear tactics, to the testimony, in advocacy of this bill, of the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, Bishop of Grand Rapids; to the testimony of another distinguished Catholic bishop, the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago; to the testimony of Rabbi William F. Rosenblum, president of the Synagogue Council of America; to the testimony of the Reverend Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America; to the testimony of representatives of practically every religious faith in the Nation.

Mr. President, for any Member of the Senate to try by word or by the inflection of his voice to indicate that this legislation is Communist-inspired is, in my opinion, blasphemy, and should be so labeled. Believe me, Mr. President, there are other arguments than arguments based on rumor or smear or distortion, to be made in connection with this legislative proposal. There are other arguments which can be made against FEPC, but FEPC is not to be attacked on the ground of alleging that it is Communist-inspired or Communist-supported.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Minnesota deny the expression of this philosophy which first appeared, so far as politics are concerned, in the Communist National Party platform in May of 1928?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not interested in Communist Party platforms. I have never read one, and I do not want to read one. I have read the testimony of the great religious leaders of this country, who, I am sure, have more knowledge of communism than most Senators have, or at least as much; and I believe that their testimony is not based upon any political party platform, but is based upon the moral discipline of their religious faith.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator from Minnesota deny the finding and the declaration made by the Bipartisan California Committee on Un-American Activities, a committee of the California Legislature, of the very conclusive fact that Communists did inspire and were behind and were the agitators and the prime supporters of FEPC, as proposed in the initiative in California in 1946, which was plastered down or turned down so definitely by the vote of the people of California?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I am not familiar with the activities of the California Un-American Activities Committee, except that many persons in California do not think too well of it.

I am not familiar with that referendum vote; I do not have that information. I shall be more than happy to reply as to that when we come to the debate on FEPC.

However, I know what I believe to be the truth. I believe that the truth is that in politics in America, when someone wishes to kill a proposal, he merely has to find that the Communists have supported it. Of course, in that connection all we have to do is stand still and watch and listen, and we shall find that such arguments about such Communist support will make the full circle.

Mr. President, I have my own faith, and it is grounded in the Judeo-Christian democracy. If the Communists happen to subscribe to it once in awhile, I will not leave it. After all, the Communists can be right once in awhile, I suppose.

Mr. President, the facts in this matter are crystal-clear. The facts are that the most responsible, the most enlightened, the most devoted citizens of the United States have appeared before the committees of Congress to testify in behalf of this legislation.

I resent the fact that every time a decent bill comes before the Senate, a bill which has good purposes and good objectives, some Senator must drag in the Communists. On that basis, I suppose we will get rid of the American flag because it has red in it. Mr. President, it is simply ridiculous.

Let us debate this bill on its merits, not on the basis that somehow or another, somewhere, way back when, someone who was digging around in Communist literature—which I would say is not very good literature to be digging around in—found that the Communist Party was in favor of some kind of FEPC.

I prefer to receive my inspiration from men like Monsignor Ryan, rather than Earl Browder; I prefer to receive my inspiration from men like Bishop Haas, rather than Joe Stalin.

I prefer to read the literature of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, rather than the Daily Worker; and I shall read that literature, rather than snoop around in the moth-eaten files of the Daily Worker.

Mr. President, let us nail down several points which need to be nailed down. First of all, whenever the minority of the Senate wants something, it does not talk about parliamentary tricks, about hearings, or anything else of that sort. Measures which are approved by the minority are shouted through so quickly that we scarcely realize what has happened.

However, when there is a measure which some Senator does not want, then Senators can resort to mere rules and regulations and can dig back into 45 manuals to find out ways of preventing the consideration of that measure.

Let me say that the statements I made on the American Forum of the Air were considered statements, and the words I used at that time were considered words. I submit that in America today a job which needs to be done is the reapportionment of the State legislatures in order to get adequate and proportionate representation in the respective State legislatures.

The Senator from Florida does not need to take my word about that. The American Political Science Association, made up of the most eminent men in political science in this country, says that reapportionment is needed in many States—that legislatures, without regular reapportionment, are unrepresentative. In the State of Minnesota we have not had reapportionment since 1910. I am looking at my friend, the Senator from California. California has not had reapportionment for a long time, either. They have not had it in many States. In 1910, the population of the State of Minnesota was much less than it is today, yet the same number of representatives serve in the State legislature from the respective counties today as served in 1910. The Senator from Minnesota was not talking about the character or the qualities of the individual legislators. They are splendid, fine citizens. They do the best they can. They represent their point of view, and they represent a point of view honestly. The need for reapportionment is exemplified by the county in which the city of Minneapolis is located. In 1910 this county had about 350,000 people.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That county now has almost a million people, with the same number of representatives in the legislature. I submit that is not proper representation. It is not fair representation. The Governor of our State says it is not fair, the Democratic Party says it is not right, the Republican Party says it is not right, the League of Women Voters, the chamber of commerce, the A. F. of L., the CIO—not a single responsible political group or economic group in the State underwrites the lack of proper apportionment of the legislature.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, with the understanding that in doing so he shall not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator may be entirely familiar with the situation in Minnesota, and I take it he is. The Senator is mistaken, however, when the says the Legislature of California has not been reapportioned since 1910.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I did not say that.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Perhaps I misunderstood.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator said that the problem of reapportionment exists in California, as it does in other States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think the matter of apportionment of the Legislature of the State of California is an entirely proper one under the constitution of the State. The assembly, which represents the districts, is divided according to population as shown by the Federal census. The State senate is under the so-called Federal plan, which has been challenged on several occasions, and in each case the people of California by an overwhelming direct vote of the people have sustained the Federal plan of apportionment. So, while the Senator may speak for Minnesota, I wish he would be more accurate in speaking for California.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very happy to receive the information regarding California. I am glad the Senator is so happy with the situation there. I know that his constituents will be very happy to know it, too. The situation, according to the Senator from California, is one that is perfectly satisfactory to the great majority of the people of California. I accept that. I was only quoting what has been a review of the respective State legislatures in the United States by impartial, non-political, disinterested persons, who are in the field of government as a science—the American Political Science Association.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It may well be that there are some distinguished, eminent gentlemen living in various sections of the country who may disagree with the Federal plan of apportionment as it exists in the State of California. My only point is that the provisions under which we apportion the legislature are provided in the constitution of the State. Under the constitution of California, the people have a chance to vote directly through constitutional amendments or through the initiative or the referendum, and to pass judgment on it. In each case, when an attempt has been made to change the apportionment, the people by an overwhelming vote have sustained the provisions of our State constitution. It seems to me to be a bit strange for the eminent Senator from Minnesota, who apparently believes in the working of the democratic process, that when the people of a sovereign State have spoken, not once but on several occasions, and have sustained them, to cite as a reason for change the fact that a few academic people may disagree with the procedures which the people of California have adopted.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota does not think that at all. He said he was more than happy to receive the information from the Senator from California. I may say it will be of great interest to the Members of the United States Senate. As the people from California wish to be apportioned, that is their wish, and it shall be done. As the State constitution prescribes, so be it. That is exactly the way it ought to be. I merely say that one of the problems of the American Government over the Nation has been the lack of apportionment and reapportionment.

Let me get back now to Minnesota.

I only want to point out, Mr. President, what has been said about Minnesota, that the junior Senator from Minnesota, in making his statement that the legislature did not represent the will of the people, again repeats that statement. Let me now document it. First of all——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator does not yield at this time.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD following my remarks a poll, a State-wide poll of September 7, 1949, which poll I have often referred to on the floor of the Senate, a poll that is made by the Minneapolis Morning Tribune. Its authenticity has been well-established throughout the years. It has the variables of percentage weakness that any poll may have. However, great effort has been made to make this an accurate one, which shows that 76 percent of the people in Minnesota believe the Congress should pass a law to guarantee everyone in the United States an equal chance to get a job according to his abilities, regardless of race, religion, or

nationality. That was a poll which was taken just about a year ago.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. Another poll was taken pertaining to the kind of legislation which is pending before the United States Senate, talking about a specific law, not just the general principle, but a specific bill with teeth in it—enforcement powers. That poll showed that 54 percent of the people of Minnesota are in favor of a Federal law which would say to employers that they cannot discriminate against applicants because of their race, religion, or nationality.

The second poll which I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD is dated February 12, 1950. That is within the last 2 or 3 months. It demonstrates a rising tide of favorable public opinion in my State toward fair employment practices. And, since I have been told that I should confine myself to my State, I shall confine myself to that particular area of the country. In this poll, 79 percent of the people agree with the statement, "It is up to the Federal Government to see to it that all people—whites, Negroes, and other races; Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—have the same chances of getting jobs from any employer, assuming they are qualified to do the work."

I ask unanimous consent that this poll be printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. At this point I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement submitted by the Minnesota Council for the Fair Employment Act. This statement gives evidence that responsible business leaders in our community are in favor of FEPC legislation. It also indicates that this legislation is supported by both political parties in our State, the major labor organizations, the Minnesota Department of the American Legion, and numerous other civic groups. I ask that the names of the officers of the Minnesota Council for Fair Employment Practice also be printed. I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I also want to bring to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Minnesota State Executive Board of the League of Women Voters has just voted to recommend to the members that the league support fair employment practices legislation as an action program in the next session of the Minnesota Legislature.

My colleague on the floor made reference to the legislature. I agree with his reference to the legislature, insofar as the quality of its membership is concerned. It has a membership of high character, of good morals, and fine background. The issue to which the Senator from Minnesota is extending his remarks is simply this, that the Senator from Florida made comment upon the fact that the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, as reported and as mentioned by the junior Senator from Minnesota, was not representative of the will of the people on the issue of FEPC. Mr. President, never was a truer statement ever made. The Governor of our State, who was elected in a Democratic year, was a Republican, and his major issue was the issue of human rights. The junior Senator from Minnesota, who served 2 terms as mayor of his city, a city of over 500,000 people, had as one of his major issues the issue of a fair employment practices law. I shall not burden the RECORD with the majority votes which were piled up, but they were sufficient and substantial. What is more important is that the responsible business leadership and spiritual leadership of our State, the responsible educational leadership of Minnesota, the responsible veterans' leadership of our State, all have gone before the legislature urging favorable action. The Minnesota State Senate passed it. The house of representatives acted somewhat like the Senate of the United States—it delayed it, and, in the process of delaying it, it was tabled in the committee.

So I would say, in view of the appropriate comments of the Senator from California, no one knows more about a State than do those who represent it; and since I have heard of reapportionment and the legislature in California, and I accept it—let me ask my colleagues of the United States Senate to accept as a matter of fact and truth, with a good deal of substantiating evidence, the assertion by the junior Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, I should like to note the position of Minnesota business and civic leaders, men like Bradshaw Mintener, vice president and general counsel of Pillsbury Mills, who favors FEPC legislation; men in industry, prominent contractors, men in the retail establishments, such as York Langton, the trade extension manager of the Coast to Coast Stores. Mr. Stuart W. Leck, on the basis of his business experience, endorses and supports FEPC legislation.

For example, Mr. President, one Julius H. Barnes, president of the Barnes Shipbuilding Co., who served as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce for three terms, appeared personally before the House Labor Committee and said:

> I am glad to confirm to you that by study, observation, and conviction I feel that the proposed FEPC legislation * * * is entitled to public approval and public confidence.

As I have mentioned, great educational leaders of our State support it. Dr. Lawrence Gould, president of Carleton College, presented the following written testimony:

> We have no right to expect approval of our way of life by other nations unless we take a forthright position toward matters of this sort. I want to add my recommendation concerning the desirability of such a bill. It is only in line with what we have always protested to be our democratic American ideas. I do not see how anyone who prides himself upon our American heritage can do less than give his wholehearted support to this bill.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this statement be incorporated in the body of the RECORD, and I ask that particular emphasis be placed in the reading of the statement upon the caliber and character of the individuals who have testified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. HUMPHREY. I make this further observation, Mr. President. It was not only the city vote to which I had reference, but, as a matter of fact, in the farm country 61 percent of the farm people were in support of FEPC legislation, 50 percent in the cities, and 56 percent in the towns of middle size.

Mr. President, at a later date it is my intention——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the Senator now does not wish to have this statement which I read into the RECORD, stand with reference to his own State, the statement being as follows:

> I want to repeat, that there is no one area of government in the United Ctates that is more lacking in true representation of the majority will of the people than the legislatures.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, not at all. That is absolutely true. I would not want to make a move of political expediency here to please someone. The RECORD is perfectly clear. The views of some persons are not as important as what is the truth. The truth is that what I have said is true, and it will remain so.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I listened with interest to the comments which the Senator made with reference to the attitude of church people. I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the RECORD a letter dated January 1, 1950, from G. M. Lane, chairman of the American Council of Christian Churches of California, which deals with this subject; and I wish to make it very clear that the group of churches of which he is the head does not support FEPC legislation, but regards it as ungodly. The letter ends with the following paragraph:

> We cannot correct discrimination against employees by establishing discrimination against employers. FEPC would only tend to increase tensions between classes and groups and could really benefit only those who desire to sow discord and confusion among our people. In this connection—

Says this churchman—

> it is interesting to note that the Communist Party is always one of the very active proponents of FEPC legislation. They must have some stake in it.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire letter be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall not object. I merely say it is the opinion of one church leader. Everyone has a right to his opinion. If we are going to add up the opinions of individuals, this bill should have been passed last week. So far as the responsible organizations who are in support of it are concerned, we would not have needed any debate. There are differences of opinion. This business of bringing in by the doctrine of association, by innuendo, the subject of communism and socialism every time the Senate is considering a question, is a little beneath the dignity of the United States Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter is as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 1, 1950.

The Honorable SPESSARD LINDSEY HOLLAND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Doubtless there will be FEPC legislation brought before the Congress this session.

We have consistently opposed this type of legislation and we still do.

FEPC legislation would rob the employer of the right to choose whom he would to work for him. This right was upheld by Jesus Christ when He approvingly quoted the employer as saying, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" (Matthew 20:15). An employer does have the God-given right to choose whom he will to work for him. There is a kind of discrimination that is not wrong.

We realize that there is a kind of discrimination that is wrong. We hold no brief for the one who hates another or for one who discriminates solely because of the color of skin. However, we are convinced that this discrimination is not as prevalent as some of our liberal friends would have us believe. We attended a meeting sponsored by an organization that was pushing FEPC and at which representatives of other allied groups were present. A call was made for any authentic cases of discrimination that could be brought before the California legislative body that was considering their bill. Among all the organizations represented (all of which were left-wing groups) only two individuals were found in the ranks of these groups in all of the Los Angeles area who would go before a legislative hearing and testify that they had been discriminated against. Surely this does not indicate a very serious situation.

FEPC, if adopted, would act as an effective extension of the police state. To set up a Government agency as the arbiter of employment in private business is to add one more control to the already burdensome load which is being borne by the private-enterprise system. This private-enterprise system, which in our modern world is so distinctively American, is the only economic system which is stamped with the approval of the word of God. And that private-enterprise system is the economic system which has made our Nation great.

We cannot correct discrimination against employees by establishing discrimination against employers. FEPC would only tend to increase tensions between classes and groups and could really benefit only those who desire to sow discord and confusion among our people. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Communist Party is always one of the very active proponents of FEPC legislation. They must have some stake in it.

Sincerely,

G. M. LANE,
Chairman.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. For a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Without encumbering the record I should like to say one thing briefly, and then I shall be through. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has letters from pastors of every known evangelical denomination, and from Catholic societies, stating that no one has authority in any of those groups to speak for their denominations, but they personally are strongly opposed to FEPC and believe that the great majority of their churchmen in those various groups oppose it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. In view of the comments of the Senator from Florida, I ask unanimous consent at this time to have incorporated in the body of the RECORD page 5, page 6, and down to the heading at the bottom of page 7, of the report of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on Senate bill 1728.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As was to be expected, distinguished leaders of the clergy and laity in all of our major faiths have led in the condemnation of job discrimination as an outrage to the central spirit of our religious beliefs. Such discrimination has been unremittingly denounced as immoral, unjust, and an affront to the innate dignity of man.

One of the outstanding witnesses before the House committee was the Reverend Samuel McCrea Cavert, general secretary of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Dr. Cavert appeared at the direction of the executive committee of the council which comprises a federation of 27 national denominations with 28,000,000 members. In his testimony urging this legislation, Dr. Cavert pointed out that in addition to the federal council, explicit support for antidiscrimination in employment legislation has come from conventions of the general conference of the Methodist Church, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, the Northern Baptist Convention, the general council of the Congregational Christian Churches, and the general synod of the Evangelical and Reformed Church. Negro Protestant churches on record for FEPC include the four leading denominations—the National Baptist Convention, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, the African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, and the Colored Methodist Church. Dr. Cavert indicated only two exceptions to this statement of the views of American Protestantism, namely, the Southern Baptists and the Presbyterian Church in the United States (Southern).

Great leaders of the Roman Catholic Church added their voices in behalf of a Federal Fair Employment Practice Act. As long ago as 1944, the late Msgr. John A. Ryan told a subcommittee of this committee that he favored this legislation because "The Christian precept of brotherly love is not satisfied by mere well-wishing, nor benevolent emotion, nor sentimental yearning. It requires action." In 1947, the Most Reverend Francis J. Haas, bishop of Grand Rapids, said in a letter to the chairman of this committee:

"I earnestly hope that this bill will become law.

"I offer no lengthy comment on the underlying principle of the bill; that is, that all American citizens are equal, and that all are entitled to have their right to equal opportunity protected by law. To me both as an American citizen and as a Catholic bishop this principle needs no supporting argument. Equality is among our most treasured American possessions, as it is a central doctrine of Christian faith, which proclaims that all men are equal before God, made equal before Him through His Divine Son, Jesus Christ."

Yet another distinguished Catholic bishop, the Most Reverend Bernard J. Sheil, of Chicago, said:

"A fair employment practices law would give legal recognition to that God-given dignity which every human being possesses. Economic discrimination is immoral; it is clearly sinful. How long are we expected to sit by while children of God find their paths blocked at every point by the forces of bigotry and discrimination?"

Leaders of American Judiasm have joined with the Christian clergy in pointing to the spiritual and moral need and foundation for this bill. Rabbi William F. Rosenblum, president of the Synagogue Council of America, told a subcommittee of this committee:

"It is natural that religious groups should come strongly to the support of any measure which puts into practice the fundamental principle that we have 'one Father and that one God made us all.' * * *. However, it is not merely from a theological point of view that we feel strong effort must be made against discrimination, but from the more practical aspect of preserving the rights of our citizens and especially of furthering the aims of our form of government."

Other members of the rabbinate, both Orthodox and Reformed, seconded Rabbi Rosenblum.

Vigorous support for these expressions by their clergymen has come from the laity in all three faiths. Organizations representing millions of God-fearing Protestants, Catholic, and Jewish men and women have sent their lay leaders to affirm that they share the views of their spiritual leaders.

Moreover, testimony based upon practical considerations of benefit has mounted. Sociologists have testified that poverty born of discrimination breeds disease, squalor, and crime. Economists have pointed out that States with the lowest per capita income are those in which discrimination is most severe.

This is clear evidence that when large numbers of persons are prevented from working on jobs for which they are qualified by education, training, and skill, the purchasing power and standard of living of the total community sinks accordingly.

Almost all labor unions have joined in the demand for an end to discrimination in employment on the ground that it depresses wages and creates divisions inimical to the trade-union movement.

Illustrative of this point is the resolution of the American Federation of Labor adopted unanimously in November 1948 and inserted in the hearings of the House in 1949 (H. R. 4453) on page 300 as follows:

"Whereas a Federal FEPC law is essential for the elimination of discrimination in employment relations based upon race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, and since the right to work is tied up with the right to live, which is God-given: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Sixty-seventh convention of the American Federation of Labor assembled in Cincinnati, Ohio, November 1948, reaffirm its position of supporting the movement for Federal fair-employment-practice legislation and call upon the Eighty-first Congress to enact legislation for an effective Fair Employment Practices Commission."

The vigorous attitude of the CIO in forming a committee to abolish discrimination and following through both by application of antidiscrimination principles and support of the President's policy is further attested in its Resolution No. 8, the concluding part of which will be found on page 334 of the House hearings in words as follows:

"Resolved, That the tenth constitutional convention of the CIO hereby pledges itself to continue the struggle to achieve the full,

equal enjoyment of all the rights guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

"We demand:

"1. The passage of Federal and local fair-employment practice acts.

"2. The abolition of segregation in the armed forces.

"3. The enactment of a Federal antilynching bill.

"4. The passage of Federal and State legislation outlawing poll taxes and other restrictions on the right to vote.

"5. The passage of measures to ban segregation in interstate travel.

"6. The enactment of safeguards against racial discrimination in Federal appropriations for State aid.

"7. The enactment of civil-rights laws in all States which now do not have such laws eliminating segregation.

"8. The abolition of the Thomas-Rankin committee.

"9. The enactment of laws protecting aliens long resident in the United States and regularizing their status.

"10. The establishment of guaranties to protect the freedom of thought and the freedom of political views of Government workers and the revocation of Executive Order 9835."

Businessmen, too, particularly in the more recent hearings, appeared to testify or submitted statements expressing their opinion that discrimination is a "fool's economy," that it is uneconomical, cutting down the size of markets, increasing costs of production, and raising the burden of taxation.

For example, Mr. Eric Johnston, former president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, has been widely quoted in favor of Federal fair employment practice legislation and in a letter dated February 1, 1949, Mr. Julius H. Barnes, also a former chamber of commerce president, wrote as follows:

"The FEPC ideal appears to me to be one of even-handed justice and equal opportunity, assured by the authority of government itself. The instinctive American respect for equal treatment and for fair play would be strengthened and stimulated by such an attitude on the part of Government itself."

In this connection, the testimony of Elwood S. McKenney, commissioner, Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission, to be found on page 249 of the House hearings, is significant. Mr. McKenney stated in part as follows:

"I would like to examine our experience in the 3 years of this law in Massachusetts. Prior to the enactment of the statute in Massachusetts the representatives of industry said that the passage of FEPC legislation would create such a burden upon employers that the most damaging effect it would have would be to drive business out of the State. Well, the 1948 report of the Boston Chamber of Commerce speaks for itself. That report said that during 1948, the third year that the fair-employment practice law was in effect, 36 new business organizations had been established in metropolitan Boston, and further than that, 58 existing firms had begun new construction at a cost of $300,000,000 * * *.

"It is also significant that after 2½ years of FEPC in Massachusetts, the Associated Industries in Massachusetts and the Boston Chamber of Commerce both issued statements that although they were not in favor of the law as a matter of principle, they were satisfied legislation of that type could be administered without causing a burden upon industry. That doesn't mean that the Commission has been remiss in its duties, it simply means it has won the confidence of business."

And finally, there is the testimony of our diplomats that discrimination has an adverse effect on our relations with other nations; that it constitutes a formidable obstacle to the development of mutual understanding and trust, and that we will have better international relations when this obstacle is removed.

In all the volumes of testimony, in all the array of witnesses who appeared at the committee hearings, including those who appeared in opposition to the proposed legislation, there was not one who disputed the ideal of equality of opportunity, not one who rose to defend the principle of discrimination, not one who challenged the fact that discrimination in employment is an unmitigated evil.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, since I understand that I may be denied the right to the floor at a later time, because I have spoken today, I had intended to make some remarks in a very brief statement which I had prepared, not pertaining to the Minnesota Legislature, but to the whole picture. I realize that it is late, and I had not intended to proceed at this time. I gather that there may be some difficulty in making the statement at a later time, so I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the morning hour, I be permitted to make my statement. If I am not interrupted, I do not think it will take more than 15 minutes. The statement is seven pages long, in triple space. However, I do not ask for that limitation of time. I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate tomorrow, right after the routine business has been transacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of September 7, 1949]

MINNESOTA POLL—54 PERCENT IN STATE FAVOR FEDERAL FEPC LEGISLATION

Minnesotans are in favor of the broad principle of equality in job opportunities for people of all races, religious, and nationalities, a State-wide survey by the Minnesota poll indicates. But they are less strongly in favor of specific legislation that would restrain employers from rejecting job applicants on account of race, religion, or nationality.

Proposals for fair-employment practices legislation that would bar discrimination in employment have been made to Congress by President Truman on a number of occasions. Little headway has been made by supporters in Congress thus far. A bill in the State legislature to equalize employment opportunities failed at the last session.

Minnesota poll interviewers asked a representative cross-section of the State's voting-age men and women two questions about their views on that kind of legislation, but one question was couched in very general terms, and the second was specific in referring to a prohibition against discrimination by employers in the kinds of people they hired. The first question was:

"Do you believe that Congress should pass a law that would guarantee everyone in the United States an equal chance to get a job according to his abilities, regardless of his race, religion, or nationality?"

The replies:

	All	City	Town	Farm
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
Yes, should	76	74	82	76
No, should not	19	21	15	15
Qualified	1	1	1	2
No opinion	4	4	2	7
Total	100	100	100	100

Some people contended "we don't need any such law; it's already in the Constitution." Several giving qualified answers said there should be a guaranty "for people who are citizens." Eighty-four percent of the women, 83 percent of the Democratic-Farmer-Laborites, 83 percent of the people with grade-school educations, and 83 percent of the voters who supported Truman last November, are agreed that such a law should be passed.

The second question was:

"How about a Federal law that would say to employers: 'You cannot turn down job seekers because of their race, religion, or nationality'; would you be in favor of, or against, that kind of law?"

	All	City	Town	Farm
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
In favor	54	50	56	61
Against	34	36	37	27
Qualified	4	5	4	3
No opinion	8	9	3	9
Total	100	100	100	100

It is likely that the first question influenced some persons to say they are "in favor" to the second question. Several earlier Minnesota poll studies on State attitudes toward FEPC legislation showed less than half of the adults supporting such measures.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of February 12, 1950]

MINNESOTA POLL—SHOULD UNITED STATES "SEE TO IT" THAT YOU GET HOUSING AND JOB EQUALITY?

Minnesotans are in general agreement that the Federal Government should "see to it that a family can get decent housing when it needs it" and that it should assure equal job opportunities to all people, regardless of race or religion, the Minnesota poll finds. A majority of them feel, however, that it is not up to the Government "to see to it that a person can get a job when he needs it."

There is disagreement over the idea that the Federal Government should "see to it that a family can get medical care when it needs it." Fifty-one percent think the Government should bear that responsibility; 44 percent think it should not.

In one form or another, all four of those issues—housing, fair employment practices, medical care and full employment, are before Congress this year. In his message to Congress last month, President Truman urged enactment of FEPC legislation, national health insurance, an adequate housing program for middle-income families (Congress last year passed a low-rent housing and slum-clearance measure), and "basic protection against the economic hazards of * * * unemployment."

The Minnesota poll survey of State attitudes concerning Federal responsibilities in those four fields was made on a broad, generalized basis, without reference to any specific legislative proposal.

Interviewers told a representative cross-section of Minnesota men and women, living in cities and towns, and on farms:

"I'm going to read you a series of statements, and I'd like to know whether you agree or disagree with each of them."

The statements, and the replies:

1. "It's up to the Federal Government to see to it that a person can get a job when he needs it." Do you agree or disagree?

	All	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Agree	36	31	39
Disagree	57	63	52
No opinion	7	6	9
Total	100	100	100

2. "It's up to the Federal Government to see to it that a family can get decent housing when it needs it." Do you agree or disagree?

	Al.	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Agree	58	55	62
Disagree	34	39	29
No opinion	8	6	9
Total	100	100	100

3. "It's up to the Federal Government to see to it that a family can get medical care when it needs it." Agree or disagree?

	All	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Agree	51	51	51
Disagree	44	43	44
Qualified	1	1	1
No opinion	4	5	4
Total	100	100	100

4. "It's up to the Federal Government to see to it that all peoples—whites, Negroes, and other races; Protestants, Catholics, and Jews—have the same chances at getting jobs from any employer, assuming they are qualified to do the work." Do you agree or disagree?

	All	Men	Women
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Agree	79	78	80
Disagree	17	18	17
No opinion	4	4	3
Total	100	100	100

People in the lower economic group and those with grade-school education are inclined to agree with all four statements regarding Federal responsibility.

Those in the upper economic group and those with college education disagree with the first three statements, but—like all other segments of the cross-section—agree with the statement that the Government should see to it that all people have equal opportunities to get jobs, if they are qualified for the work.

The survey also shows:

On seeing to it that a person can get a job when he needs it—

Democratic-Farmer-Laborites are evenly divided between agreeing and disagreeing that that should be a Federal responsibility, but two out of every three Republicans and independent voters disagree.

People who voted for Dewey in 1948 express greater disagreement (72 percent) than do people who supported Truman (52 percent disagree).

A St. Paul man who agrees that the Government should see to it that people in need of jobs get jobs says, "A man deserves a job." A Minneapolis woman comments, "Everyone should be able to get work." An Ada woman thinks that "jobs are scarce and it's going to get worse."

But a St. Louis Park man feels that "that's not the function of the Federal Government"; a Rushton farmer says, "I've always had to get my own job—why not everybody else?" and an Ortonville man thinks that "if a man hasn't got enough incentive to get a job himself, he isn't much good."

On providing decent housing—

Sixty-three percent of the city people say the Federal Government should see to it that "a family can get decent housing when it needs it." Little more than half (51 percent) of the farm people share that opinion.

"If you have a Government by the people and for the people, they should be interested in people's welfare," a Champlin man contends. "They should spend money for housing instead of sending it to Europe," is the opinion of a Sacred Heart farmer.

On the other hand, a Minneapolis man says that "that's too close to the welfare state"; a St. Charles farmer wants people to "take care of themselves," and a Goodhue woman feels that "the Government shouldn't be our grandfather at all."

On seeing to it "that a family can get medical care when it needs it"—

People in the lower economic group are strongly in favor of having the Government provide that assurance, as those in the upper economic group are opposed to that idea:

	Upper	Middle	Lower
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Agree	34	48	63
Disagree	64	47	30
Qualified	1	1	1
No opinion	1	4	6
Total	100	100	100

The few persons offering qualified answers say the Government should see to it that needy families get medical care when they need it, or that the Government should see that medical care is available in all places, but not free care.

In the 30–49 age groups, there are as many men and women who disagree as agree that the Government should assume the responsibility, but among people 21–29 years of age and among those 50 and older, more than half agree with the statement.

On seeing to it that all people, regardless of race or religion, have the same chances at getting jobs—

More than three out of every four city, town, and farm residents agree that that is a Federal responsibility.

Eighty-six percent of the labor union members questioned support that position. So do 88 percent of the Democratic-Farmer-Laborites, 76 percent of the independent voters and 69 percent of the Republicans.

A Rochester man declares the Government "shouldn't tell private employment whom they can and can't hire," and a Minneapolis man says, "I want the opportunity of picking help as I see fit."

Typical of the majority's comments is this from a Minneapolis man: "The only basis should be qualifications and ability."

EXHIBIT 3

THE POSITION OF MINNESOTA BUSINESS AND CIVIC LEADERS ON THE PROPOSED FEPC BILL

You have been told that the employers of Minnesota are opposed to a State FEPC bill. That is not true. The 100 letters from employers presented to the legislature by Otto Christenson were secured by intensive solicitation of the 1,100 members of his organization. In securing these letters and in preparing his pamphlet against the proposed bill, Christenson has spoken with complete disregard for, and in absolute contradiction to, the record of actual experience with the operation of fair employment practice commissions in the cities of Minneapolis and Philadelphia and the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey. Similar commissions recently began operation in the States of Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, and Rhode Island. Their experience so far has been equally favorable.

It was evident that the employers who wrote those letters and who appeared to testify against the bill had had absolutely no experience with fair employment practice commissions and were completely misinformed as to the actual record of their operations. If these employers were correctly informed as to the facts, we are confident that they would support the present bill.

Practical Minnesota businessmen who once had honest doubts about the value of a fair employment practice law have become enthusiastic supporters of such legislation after examining the record of the Minneapolis Fair Employment Practice Commission. Many of these informed employers joined in urging the enactment of State legislation last spring.

Bradshaw Mintener, vice president and general counsel of Pillsbury Mills, addressed a letter to other employers over the State in which he said:

"After considerable thought and reflection, I have come to the conclusion that as a Nation we cannot afford the luxury of having people in it who practices discrimination. * * * I cannot see how we can ever realize our full measure of national economic well-being until every man and every woman is not only permitted, but encouraged, to work at whatever he can best do, regardless of his color, his religion, or his social standing. * * * I am confident that after you have given this matter the thought and consideration that it requires, we will be able to count you an ally in the task that faces us in making fair-employment practices a reality in the State of Minnesota."

Stuart W. Leck, president of the Leck Construction Co., wrote: "As a Minnesota employer, I endorse the fair-employment-practices bill. Action, not lip service, is needed if equality of opportunity is no longer to be denied some of our citizens solely because of their color or religion. * * * I have carefully read and considered your bill. I have confidence that it will be sanely administered, thereby helping to correct present abuses and buttressing our republican form of government."

Both of these men had urged the city council to delay action on the ordinance at the time it was enacted because they had serious doubts that such legislation was either necessary or desirable. W. H. Feldmann, president of Electric Machinery Manufacturing Co., had shared their misgivings. In explaining how the legislation had gained his support, he said, "I should like to express indorsement of the bill to create a State commission against discrimination in employment. While I have long been wholeheartedly for these objectives, I have had some misgivings in the past as to possible abuses in administration of such a law. However, the administration of the city of Minneapolis ordinance has worked exceedingly well because of the restraint and good judgment applied by the commission. Under the provisions of your bill, it seems likely that equally intelligent administration will result. Certainly such legislation will more rapidly advance the elimination of the

handicapping of employment opportunities due to prejudice. And the attainment of that objective warrants some risk."

One of the most significant statements in support of the proposed fair employment practice bill comes from Julius H. Barnes, president of the Barnes Shipbuilding Co., who has business interests in both Minnesota and New York. He served as president of the United States Chamber of Commerce for three terms and as chairman of the board for 3 years more. He appeared personally before the House Labor Committee and also submitted a written statement, which said in part: "I am glad to confirm to you that by study, observation, and conviction I feel that the proposed FEPC legislation * * * (is) entitled to public approval and public confidence.

"I put special weight on the philosophy that in a democracy the individual is the important factor, and fairness and equality of treatment the only atmosphere in which individual character can develop.

"The FEPC ideal appears to me to be one of even-handed justice and equal opportunity, assured by the authority of the Government. The instinctive American respect for fair play would be strengthened and stimulated by such an attitude on the part of Government itself."

The first chairman of the Minneapolis Commission was George M. Jensen, regional zone manager of the Nash-Kelvinator Corp. He reported that: "A number of employers have expressed to me the conclusion that * * * the ill effects expected from the legislation have failed to develop * * *. It is my opinion that employers, employees, and citizens of our community at large, have benefited from the salutary effects of the ordinance * * *. Judging by our local experience * * * such legislation * * * at the State level * * * would prove of definite value to the citizenry of the State as a whole."

The trade extension manager of Coast-to-Coast Stores, York Langton, testified before the House Labor Committee both on the basis of his business experience and in his capacity as president of the Minnesota United Nations Association. He said: "The Minnesota United Nations Association strongly supports the Minnesota Fair Employment Practice Act * * *. This bill, if enacted into law, would give every person an opportunity to obtain employment without discrimination because of race, color, or religion.

"As a Nation profoundly interested in peace, we must recognize that this important issue of doing away with discrimination is the foundation stone on which the temple of peace must rest."

The public relations director of General Mills, Abbott Washburn, serves as a member of the Minneapolis Fair Employment Practice Commission. He appeared in person before the House Labor Committee. On the basis of his intimate knowledge he concluded that the Commission's work "has resulted in extensive correction of discriminatory practices and has opened the gates of employment opportunity to many workers who previously found them closed. It has likewise protected many employers against unfair charges of discrimination."

Harry A. Bullis, chairman of the board of General Mills, Inc., recently wrote: "From my observation of the operation of the FEPC in Minneapolis, I believe it has helped * * * to corect some of these inequities. * * * Its instigators and present members are all men of good will whose integrity and loyalty are beyond question. * * * The equalization of employment opportunities is strictly in the American tradition, and anything that promotes that equalization deserves, within reason, our support. I believe the greatest value of the FEPC ordinance has been educational. It has caused management to review employment policies and to endeavor to get rid of old prejudices."

In his written testimony in support of the proposed bill, Edward F. Waite, retired judge of the Hennepin County District Court, said, "As I look back through a long experience, I observe that the time has always come to say 'must' to those who have rejected enlightenment and persuasion; and I believe that in the field we are considering, that time has arrived. Our moral and religious convictions, our self-respect among the nations as professed lovers of freedom and champions of human rights, our economic interests to develop and utilize our potential manpower, prudent precaution against long-smoldering fires of justified resentment—all say 'now.'"

Dr. Lawrence Gould, president of Carleton College, presented the following written testimony: "We have no right to expect approval of our way of life by other nations unless we take a forthright position toward matters of this sort. I want to add my recommendation concerning the desirability of such a bill. It is only in line with what we have always protested to be our democratic American ideas. I do not see how anyone who prides himself upon our American heritage can do less than give his wholehearted support to this bill."

The active support of the Minnesota Department of the American Legion was indicated by Nate V. Keller, who testified in his capacity as chairman of the Legion's employment committee. He said: "The American Legion is very much interested in the FEPC; in fact, at every one of our past three State conventions our convention committee passed a resolution endorsing it. It would be very happy to contact by letter all the members of our State legislature advising them of the stand of the American Legion on this very important project."

The Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party has given its unanimous support to the State fair employment practice bill. The written testimony submitted by Orville L. Freeman, State chairman, included the following statements:

"At our State convention held at Brainerd on June 15, 1948, the convention of some 1,500 delegates, representing all counties in our State, unanimously adopted a clear and unequivocal position calling for the immediate establishment of a State fair employment practice commission with enforcement powers."

Bernhard W. LeVander, State chairman of the Republican Party of Minnesota, testified that: "The platform of the Republican Party adopted at the State convention of September 1948 * * * provides as follows: 'We recognize the need for the establishment of a permanent Fair Employment Practice Commission to eliminate discrimination because of race, color, religion, or national origin, in private industry as well as in Government work, including the National Guard, at the same time realizing that only education can permanently eliminate the deep-seated emotional prejudices which are the cause of discrimination.'

"The platform was passed unanimously by 1,200 delegates representing all of Minnesota's 87 counties and representing the Republican Party of our State."

In addition to those from whom we have quoted, the following citizens of Minnesota provided oral or written testimony in support of the proposed bill: Harvey Hoshour: Morgan, Chase, Headley, & Hoshour, St. Paul; faculty member, University of Minnesota Law School; member, St. Paul Council of Human Relations; Rev. Clifford Ansgar Nelson: pastor, Gloria Dei Lutheran Church, St. Paul; board member, Minnesota Federation of Churches; member, St. Paul Council of Human Relations; William Seabron: industrial secretary, Minneapolis Urban League; Whitney Young: industrial secretary, St. Paul Urban League; Robert Olson: president, Minnesota State Federation of Labor, AFL; Walter Finn: representing Ramsey County Industrial Union Council and State CIO; Lora Lou Mead: chairman, Civil Rights Committee, Carlton College Student Association, Northfield, Minn.; Lawrence E. Kelley: retired chairman, Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce; member, city of Minneapolis Fair Employment Practice Commission; Amos S. Deinard: Leonard, Street & Deinard, Minneapolis; chairman, city of Minneapolis, Fair Employment Practice Commission; Wilfred C. Leland, Jr.: executive director, city of Minneapolis, Fair Employment Practice Commission; Curtis Chivers: Minneapolis branch NAACP; Isamu Shijo: United Citizens League of Minnesota; Jonas G. Schwartz: Minneapolis attorney; Hubert Schon: United Labor Committee for Human Rights; Phyllis McAllister: faculty member, College of St. Catherine; Frank Marzitelli: Cooks & Bakers Union, AFL; Edward V. Donahue: United Steelworkers of America; Martin Hughes: attorney and civic leader, Hibbing, Minn.; Mrs. Mabeth Hurd Paige: Minneapolis civic leader and former State legislator; John G. Simmons: chairman, Minneapolis chapter, Americans for Democratic Action; 1949 chairman, Minnesota Council for Fair Employment Practice.

MINNESOTA COUNCIL FOR FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE—EXECUTIVE BOARD

Officers—Chairman: Robert C. McClure, Minneapolis attorney and associate professor of law; first vice chairman: Rev. Floyd Massey, Jr., pastor, Pilgrim Baptist Church, St. Paul; second vice chairman: Julie Villaume, State chairwoman, Minnesota Young Republican League; treasurer: Jonas G. Schwartz, Minneapolis attorney; secretary: Mrs. Arnold Karlins, Minneapolis Council of Jewish Women.

Members of the board: Edward V. Donahue, State Industrial Union Council, CIO; Frank Marzitelli, Minnesota Federation of Labor, AFL; Bradshaw Mintener, vice president and general counsel, Pillsbury Mills; general chairman, Minneapolis Community Self-Survey of Human Relations.

THE AMERASIA CASE

Mr. DONNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an insertion in the RECORD?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on May 9, 1950, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page 6687, the second of the series of articles appearing in the Washington Daily News dealing with the Amerasia case. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a continuation of the articles which appeared in the issues of that newspaper of May 10, May 11, May 12, May 15, and May 16, 1950.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Daily News of May 10, 1950]

AMERASIA CASE COSTLY TO FBI—SEVERAL HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS

(By Frederick Woltman)

The Amerasia case cost the FBI several hundred thousand dollars.

It occupied 50 to to 75 agents for nearly three wartime months. Many were crack men, brought from other parts of the country to the two concentration points, New York City and Washington.

All were experienced and some of them were lawyers.

From the start, it was the Bureau's current top-drawer investigation, because it involved Government officials and stolen Government documents.

For the State and Navy Departments to call in the FBI was proof alone of its seriousness. Government agencies prefer to wash their own dirty linen.

Agents assigned to the Amerasia case were told at the beginning it was strictly hush-hush. They were even warned against discussing any of its aspects with their associates.

ROUND-THE-CLOCK SURVEILLANCES

Round-the-clock surveillances were put on Philip J. Jaffe, Amerasia's editor, people he contacted, and the magazine's staff. Two-way radio surveillance cars were used.

At first, according to former FBI agents who worked on the case, the Bureau suspected there might be a link between Amerasia and the vast Soviet spy net operating in America with local Communists to steal atom-bomb secrets.

That top-scale atomic counterespionage job had been called off to avoid offending Russia during the formative stages of the United Nations. Arrests were held up and known Russian spies permitted to escape.

FBI investigators found there was no connection. Mr. Jaffe was interested in promoting Soviet aspirations in the Far East, not in passing data over to Russian agents.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT LAWYERS CONSIDERED CASE SOUND

But there were the secret Government records systematically rifled from State Department files—1,500 to 1,700 of them later confiscated in Amerasia's headquarters.

The FBI turned its evidence over to the Justice Department. The Department's legal talent decided it had a sound criminal case. The Department directed J. Edgar Hoover, FBI Chief, to sign the complaints and arrest the Amerasia six. It knew full well what repercusions would follow charges against two State Department officials and a naval intelligence lieutenant.

The FBI complied. Had it any doubts about the Government's case, the FBI would never have gone through with the arrests.

Spearheaded by the Communist Party and its newspaper, the Daily Worker, a crusade was started against the FBI and Joseph C. Grew, who was Acting Secretary of State when the arrests were made in June 1945.

They were accused of trying to intimidate critics of the Grew bloc in the State Department. That group favored the Chinese Nationalists as against the Chinese Reds. The defendants in the Amerasia case became heroes to the leftist press; Messrs. Grew and Hoover, the culprits.

One pro-Communist radio commentator, J. Raymond Walsh, even charged that the Amerasia arrests were part of a larger plot. They were deliberately timed, he asserted, to do the most damage to America's negotiations with Russia over the veto power in the new United Nations.

This fantastic charge was not pressed.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT BEGAN TO SOFT-PEDAL

The Justice Department began to soft-pedal news of the Amerasia affair. Less and less appeared. Evidence was quietly presented in July to one grand jury here. Then it was presented all over again in August to a new grand jury and three of Mr. Jaffe's co-defendants were permitted to testify in their own behalf. They were not indicted.

A curious thing happened about this time. I called the Justice Department for background on these developments.

"I never thought they had anything on these three," volunteered Ben B. Dulaney, Acting Director of Public Information for the Attorney General. "Anyway you papers went overboard on this story and overplayed it."

Mr. Dulaney was reminded the news stories were based on a release from the Justice Department itself, which quoted both the Department and J. Edgar Hoover. He denied there had been any such release.

"Of course," he remarked, "Hoover may have had other evidence but we don't know anything about it. No statement he made was ever cleared by our Department."

Then Mr. Dulaney said he had wasted enough time and hung up.

I checked with the FBI. Within an hour, Mr. Dulaney phoned back. He'd just learned from the FBI that there had been such a release, he said. He explained he must have been out of town when it was issued.

FBI NEVER NOTIFIED OFFICIALLY OF DECISION

On September 29, 1945, a Saturday morning, Mr. Jaffe was permitted to plead guilty and pay a $2,500 fine. Nothing was said in the court about his Communist background or that of Amerasia. No evidence was ever presented publicly about it. Jaffe later told friends that attorneys' fees cost him around $17,500.

It was from unofficial sources in New York that the FBI first learned of the Government's decision to settle the Amerasia case without a public trial, ex-FBI agents have since told the Scripps-Howard newspapers. There had been no notification from the Justice Department.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 11, 1950]

TWENTY-SIX DOCUMENTS IN AMERASIA CASE LISTED—SEIZED BY OSS AGENTS

(By Frederick Woltman)

A list of 26 Government documents recovered by agents of the Office of Strategic Services (OSS) in their wartime raid on Amerasia magazine came into possesison of the News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers today.

The list was presented last week to an executive session of the TYDINGS Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee investigating charges of communism in the State Department. It has never been made public by the Government.

The very titles refute claims that the Amerasia documents, stolen from the State Department, mostly contained inconsequential gossip.

These claims have been advanced by spokesmen for the Justice Department to explain its failure to press the prosecution of Philip J. Jaffe and his associates on Amerasia.

Many of the reports are marked "restricted," "confidential," or "secret," and deal with political and economic conditions in the Far East.

In the hands of Mr. Jaffe, a Communist, they gave him inside knowledge of Government wartime and postwar policies not available to any but top Government officials. Mr. Jaffe used this data in his magazine which was dedicated to promoting Communist aims in Asia.

The contents of the 26 documents were not learned. But their titles follow:

A Policy Toward Japan. Secret.

Report to Secretary of State No. 2796 Regarding T. V. Soong and H. H. Kung. Secret.

Plan to Permit Overseas Japanese to Organize for Political Warfare Against Japan, March 8, 1945. Secret.

Economic Policy Toward Japan, January 6, 1945. Secret.

Report to Secretary of State No. 2761 Regarding Relations Between Chiang Kai-shek and Madam Chiang Kai-shek. Secret.

India, April 1944. Restricted.

Report No. 2730 Regarding a Speech Delivered by Dr. Huang Yin-pei on May 29, 1944. Restricted.

Chinese Views Regarding the Postwar Treatment of Japan, February 22, 1945. Secret.

Transportation Conditions in China. Confidential.

The Hot Springs Institute of Pacific Relations Conference, January 25, 1945. Confidential.

An OSS Report Regarding References to Activities of Indonesia, Japan, and Occupied Areas. Confidential.

Preliminary Survey of the Economy of French Indochina. State Department.

Preliminary Survey of Industry and Mining in China. State Department.

Preliminary Survey of the Economy of Thailand.

Preliminary Economic Survey of Korea.

OSS Report Re Gen. Fang Chien-chueh. Stamped by State Department.

Report No. 1486 to Secretary of State from American Ambassador at Chungking.

Report of OSS Regarding the PPC as Viewed by a Chinese Liberal.

Importance of Reconstruction of Agriculture—China.

Military Intelligence Summary—Europe.

State Department Policy.

Personal Intelligence—Far East.

Personal Intelligence—Near and Middle East.

China's First Public Opinion Poll With Source as the OSS, Research and Analysis Branch, Report No. 78.

Report to Secretary of State No. 2914.

Official Japanese Broadcasts, North American Affairs.

HUNDREDS OF OTHERS

The February 22, 1945, secret report on the postwar treatment of Japan was dated just 17 days before it was found in Mr. Jaffe's office by the OSS raiders.

Frank Brooks Bielaski, OSS chief investigator who led the raid, found hundreds of similar documents, some of a military character. Fearful his superiors in Washington might doubt the magnitude of his find, he seized the 26 as a sampling.

It was OSS's discovery of these documents that led to the subsequent FBI investigation and raid on Amerasia which uncovered 1,500 reports.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 12, 1950]

FELLOW TRAVELS OF ANDREW ROTH—AMERASIA MYSTERY DEFENDANT

(By Frederick Woltman)

Andrew Roth was one of the mystery defendants in the Amerasia case. But it didn't handicap him then—or since.

If anything, his association with Philip K. Jaffe, key figure in the stolen-documents arrests, and with Mr. Jaffe's Communist-line journal on the Far East, enhanced his usefulness.

The former Navy lieutenant, whose indictment in 1945 was dismissed on motion of the Government, spent a good part of last year traveling in the Far East.

His job, as correspondent for the leftist New York magazine, the Nation, was to expert on Communist progress and conquest in Asia.

Mr. Roth's itinerary took him to India, China, Siam, and Korea.

This territory must have been familiar to him. For it was in the office of his mentor, ex-boss, and confidant, Jaffe, Communist editor of Amerasia, that the FBI found hundreds of the secret wartime reports on the Far East. The reports had been taken from State Department files.

BARRED FROM INDOCHINA AS RED SYMPATHIZER

Roth's far eastern travels, however, were not all smooth sailing.

Late last summer Roth was barred from French Indochina.

Although given a visa by the French consul at Seoul, Korea, he was prevented from landing at Saigon on orders of the French high commissioner.

The French Government considered him a Communist sympathizer trying to get into Red-controlled Indochina, the French Embassy here has informed the News and other Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Before that, the Netherlands Government had refused him a visa for Indonesia.

Curious aspects of Mr. Roth's role in the Amerasia affair remain one of the chief unsolved mysteries of the case.

He had worked for Jaffe as a researcher on Amerasia, which was plugging for Soviet interests in Asia. Then he joined the Navy, which sent him to Harvard to study Japanese. Commissioned a lieutenant, he was recommended for Naval Intelligenc .

His papers were referred to the counter-intelligence section of the Third Naval District at New York. The intelligence report stated he had connections with pro-Communist groups interested in China and recommended against an assignment to Naval Intelligence.

GOT INTELLIGENCE POST DESPITE ADVERSE REPORT

Nevertheless, Roth got the assignment. One of his jobs was to serve as Navy Intelligence liaison with the State Department. And, at the time of his arrest on June 6, 1945, he was under orders to join the Joint Intelligence Center, Pacific Ocean Area, which was Admiral Nimitz's intelligence arm.

Almost a year later, after the Amerasia case washed out, a House subcommittee reviewed it. Capt. G. W. Whitfield, head of naval intelligence, testified that a Navy report showed he was suspected to be a fellow-traveler.

"Despite this he was commissioned because we were at peace with Russia," Captain Whitfield declared. "The fact a man was a Communist was not a bar to a commission."

With naval intelligence, Captain Whitfield admitted, Roth had access to secret documents. He denied that the lieutenant could obtain top secret papers.

During the 3-months FBI surveillance of Jaffe, the Communist editor saw the Navy lieutenant on numerous occasions. They met on the street, at the Statler Hotel here, in restaurants, and at Roth's home.

JOINED CRUSADE AGAINST STATE DEPARTMENT

Immediately after the Amerasia arrests, the Communist Party whipped up a crusade against the State Department. The arrests, the party charged, were instigated to silence critics of the Chinese Nationalists.

Roth jumped in, too. That same month he wrote a series of articles for a leftist New York newspaper. In it, said an introduction, "Mr. Roth * * * tells why present policies of the controlling group in the State Department toward China and Japan are sowing seeds for a third world war."

Eventually, Jaffe, Roth, and Emanuel Sigurd Larsen, a State Department China expert, were indicted for conspiracy to steal documents from official files.

Jaffe, who had a $30,000 to $40,000 annual income, pleaded guilty and paid a $2,500 fine. Larsen paid a $500 fine without contesting the charge.

Almost at once, Larsen charged that Roth had introduced him to Jaffe and Jaffe had misled him. He said he knew the Navy lieutenant as an adherent of pro-Soviet policies. He insisted the Amerasia case was whitewashed.

The Government then had the Roth indictment dismissed.

GO-BETWEEN FOR JAFFE IN WASHINGTON

In its October 1946 report to Congress on the Amerasia case, the House subcommittee which had reviewed the Amerasia case said of Roth:

"At the time of the arrest of Andrew Roth in Washington, D. C., no secret or confidential documents or copies thereof were found in his possession. The records made available to this committee indicate, however, that Roth, who had been under surveillance, was the contact man or go-between for Jaffe in Washington. He was observed at various times transmitting envelopes to Jaffe or others connected with these transactions."

[From the Washington Daily News of May 15, 1950]

TRUMAN ORDERED AMERASIA ARREST

(By Frederick Woltman)

President Truman intervened personally in the Amerasia case and ordered the arrests of the Amerasia six after the Justice Department had directed the FBI to hold them up, the Scripps-Howard Newspapers learned today.

The President reversed the Justice Department in a direct call to the FBI.

In so doing he went over the head of his own Attorney General, Tom C. Clark, now a Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

The President acted, it was learned, after Assistant Secretary of State Julius C. Holmes informed him that the Justice Department had instructed the FBI to hold the case of the stolen State Department documents in abeyance.

President Truman at once ordered the FBI to press the case as speedily and vigorously as possible.

The President also directed the FBI to notify him personally if any further instructions for a delay were received and to tell him who issued the instructions and what they were.

The events which caused President Truman's intervention in the Amerasia case follow:

On May 29, 1945, after an intensive investigation, the FBI laid its evidence before the Justice Department. The outcome of the conference was a decision to arrest Philip J. Jaffe and five associates on charges of conspiring to steal Government documents.

Two days later, on May 31, the Justice Department instructed the FBI that the Amerasia case would have to be held in abeyance until the conclusion of the San Francisco Conference on the organization of the United Nations. The FBI was to take no further action until notified.

The reason given was that arrests at that time might antagonize the Soviet delegates and cause friction in the San Francisco Conference. The Conference itself adjourned on June 26.

On June 2, Mr. Holmes heard of the delay and went to the President. The call from the White House to the FBI followed.

The arrests, consequently, were made on June 6.

Earlier, the Government had ordered the FBI to make no arrests in another investigation, which turned up a Soviet spy ring operating here to get possession of atom bomb secrets. This was done with the San Francisco Conference in mind.

In the Amerasia inquiry, however, the FBI found no link between Soviet agents and the Amerasia six. The Bureau did, however, turn up a systematic rifling of secret wartime documents from Government files.

Mr. Holmes, now United States Minister in London, had been assigned to handle the case for the State Department by Secretary Edward C. Stettinius.

LARSEN FINED

The FBI inquiry conected two State Department officials with Jaffe. One was Emmanuel Sigurd Larsen, a China specialist in the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, who eventually paid a $500 fine. The second was John S. Service, a veteran foreign-service officer who subsequently was cleared by the grand jury.

Since the inquiry showed that State Department records were being carried away in huge quantities, Mr. Holmes favored a quick prosecution to break up the practice.

He so advised Joseph C. Grew, then Acting Secretary of State, whose consent was necessary for the arrests.

Mr. Grew asked to be reassured on two points:

1. Was the FBI convinced its evidence was air tight?

2. Did the FBI believe prosecution would be successful?

Mr. Holmes brought back an affirmative answer. And Mr. Grew gave his consent.

The presidential order, reversing the Justice Department, followed.

The arrests themselves could scarcely have caused embarrassment to the American delegates at the UN conference. For the Government withheld all information in the Amerasia case.

Nor was the Communist angle mentioned in court when Jaffe pleaded guilty, nearly 3 months after the San Francisco Conference ended.

[From the Washington Daily News of May 16, 1950]

HOW FBI LINKED SIX IN AMERASIA CASE

In one of its most intensive surveillance jobs, the FBI linked Philip J. Jaffe with his five associates in the Amerasia case.

All his movements were watched in an attempt to learn how large quantities of Government records were falling into the possession of the Communist magazine editor.

Philip J. Jaffe, editor of Amerasia, key figure in case, pleaded guilty and paid $2,500 fine.

Emmanuel Sigurd Larsen, State Department China expert, paid $500 fine without contesting charge.

Lt. Andrew Roth, Naval Intelligence liaison officer with State Department, indictment dismissed on motion of Government.

Mark Gayn, free-lance writer, arrested, but grand jury failed to indict.

John S. Service, veteran State Department Foreign Service officer, at time adviser to American Embassy in Chungking; arrested but grand jury failed to indict; welcomed back into Department by Secretary James F. Byrnes.

Kate Louise Mitchell, co-editor of Amerasia; arrested; grand jury failed to indict.

In 11 weeks' work the puzzle was put together. Six arrests followed, involving charges of conspiracy to steal official documents.

In the wind-up Jaffe got off with a $2,500 fine. One codefendent, Emmanuel Sigurd Larsen, paid a $500 fine. Charges against the rest were dropped.

MEETING AT STATLER WAS FIRST REAL BREAK

Here, told step by step for the first time, is an abbreviated story of what the FBI discovered about the operations of the key figure and his codefendants in the mysterious Amerasia case:

March 21, 1945: The first real break. Jaffe left New York for Washington, registered at Statler Hotel. Met Larsen in lobby. Soon joined by Lt. and Mrs. Andrew Roth. Larsen and Jaffe carried brief cases; Lieutenant Roth, a manila envelope. Luncheon in the Colony Room.

Lieutenant Roth drove Larsen to his office in State Department's Walker Johnson Building. Then, in parking area, Roth and Jaffe examined papers over the steering wheel of auto. Then they drove to Roth's apartment, 1614 North Coomb Street, Arlington, Va.

Late in afternoon Roth drove Jaffe to Statler. Jaffe met Larsen again. They went for walk. Jaffe returned to hotel where he was joined by Roth and Mark Gayn. They

dined at a nearby Chinese restaurant. Lieutenant Roth drove Jaffe to the Union Station.

At this point the FBI began to investigate Gayn.

April 10: Larsen and Lieutenant Roth lunched together.

April 11: Mrs. Roth went to New York, stayed with parents in Mohawk Hotel, Brooklyn.

April 12: Mrs. Roth visited Jaffe in Amerasia office. Later dined at Jaffe's apartment, 49 East Ninth Street. Jaffe drove her to train.

April 15: Lieutenant Roth left Navy Building office around 9 a. m. Met Larsen on corner Eighteenth and D Streets NW., and handed him large envelope. Larsen returned to Walker Johnson Building.

ANOTHER MEETING HERE; MORE MANILA ENVELOPES

April 18. Jaffe arrived Washington, Statler Hotel. While registering met by Lieutenant Roth and Larsen, both carrying manila envelopes.

Lunched Embassy Room, returned to Jaffe's room. Remained an hour.

Later Gayn dined with Jaffe. Then Jaffe visited Larsen's apartment until midnight.

April 19: Lieutenant Roth lunched with Jaffe at Statler, then returned to Navy Department. Late in afternoon Larsen, carrying filled manila envelope, met Jaffe, carrying brief case, in lobby. They examined papers from each container. Whether any were exchanged was not determined.

Around 6 p. m. Jaffe left Statler with John S. Service who carried zipper bag. Jaffe carried nothing. Drove to Lieutenant Roth's home to attend party. Around 11 p. m. they left, Jaffe carrying manila envelope.

April 21: Carrying brief case, Gayn entered Amerasia office in New York, Left half hour later and boarded bus.

HAD DOCUMENT LATER RECOGNIZED AS SECRET

On bus Gayn seen extracting two typed documents from case. One bore word "Chungking" at top; dated July 11, 1944.

FBI agent noted heading, "To honorable, Secretary of State, Washington, D. C." The message started: "I wish to refer to No. 1183."

During Jaffe's arrest June 6, FBI agents confiscated hundreds of Government records. One was recognized as a copy of above document. It was an Embassy dispatch from Chungking, marked "Secret, not for distribution," and reported on dissension in Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek's household.

April 24: Mr. Service went to New York, stayed in Gayn's apartment. Same night they entertained guests, including Jaffe and Kate Louise Mitchell.

April 25: Mr. Service visited Jaffe at Amerasia.

May 7: Jaffe arrived in Washington, met Larsen and Lieutenant Roth, each bearing manila envelope, in Statler. Larsen, Lieutenant Roth left without envelopes.

JAFFE WENT WITH SERVICE TO STATE DEPARTMENT

May 8: Jaffe had breakfast with Mr. Service went with him to State Department, and stayed nearly an hour.

After noon Lieutenant Roth visited Jaffe at Statler, carrying manila envelope; remained 2 hours.

Later Larsen met Jaffe in lobby, soon departed.

Jaffe joined by Mr. Service and Lieutenant Roth. Mr. Service left quickly. Lieutenant Roth and Jaffe dined.

Jaffe returned to New York.

May 28: Jaffe visited Washington, met Lieutenant Roth and Larsen in the Statler. Lieutenant Roth had letterhead-size parcel; Larsen manila envelope. Had lunch.

May 29: Lieutenant Roth, carrying briefcase, visited Jaffe at Statler. Larsen visited Jaffe. That evening, Lieutenant Roth, Jaffe, and Service left Statler to spend evening at Arlington, Va., apartment.

May 30: Larsen visited Jaffe at Statler. In evening, Jaffe visited Larsen home. Lieutenant Roth was present.

The Larsens and Jaffe had dinner at Chinese Lantern Cafe.

Jaffe returned to New York. Went to Gayn's apartment, remaining from 1 to 3:30 a. m.

FBI SEIZED 1,700 GOVERNMENT RECORDS

June 6: Amerasia arrests. In Jaffe's office at Amerasia, FBI agents found 1,700 Government records, some marked "confidential," "secret," and "top secret."

They originated from Military Intelligence, Naval Intelligence, the State Department, the Office of War Information, and Office of Strategic Services.

SETTLEMENT OF THE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the people of the Nation are relieved at the announcement of the settlement of the railway strike which strike-bound four railroads, namely, the Pennsylvania Railroad west of Harrisburg, the New York Central Railroad west of Buffalo, the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, and the Southern Railway, and before its conclusion it had been supplemented by instructions to firemen of a fifth railroad, namely, the Union Pacific Railway, not to conduct trains over a 100-mile stretch of Santa Fe tracks used by the Union Pacific Railway in California.

A dispatch of yesterday by George Eckel, from Chicago, which appeared in this morning's New York Times, called attention to the fact that the New York Central, which had previously laid off 40,000 employees, yesterday furloughed 10,000 additional employees, many of them—and I call special attention to this fact—in the eastern area of the system which is the area of the New York Central system which had not been struck. The dispatch calls attention to the fact, further, that with this new lay-off of 10,000 additional employees the total unemployment because of the strike appeared to have passed the 200,000 mark.

Mr. President, I do not think that the article shows with absolute certainty whether the writer was referring solely to unemployment with the railroads themselves. The fact is, of course, that in addition to the many thousands who were out of work on the railroads an increasing number of persons either had lost their work or would soon lose their work in the industries which were dependent upon the maintenance of transportation.

In a dispatch of May 13, Mr. Eckel had pointed out:

> Unemployment resulting from the walkout hovered around the 200,000 mark, with—

I call special attention again to this important fact—

> with nonstriking railroad employees accounting for perhaps three-quarters of the total.

Mr. President, according to the information which Mr. Eckel thus gave us, with unemployment resulting from the walk-out hovering around 200,000, perhaps 150,000 of those were nonstriking railroad employees who had lost their work, not because they were striking, but because others who had controversies with the railroad were striking. I think this is of importance, for a man who has a wife and children to support and is ready and able and anxious to work may well look with apprehension upon an industrial situation or a legal situation which permits a comparatively small group among the employees of an industry to make it impossible for the one with the family, to whom I have referred, to work or secure wages or income. With possibly 50,000 men out of work who were striking employees—I am not sure whether it was that many who were striking—Mr. Eckel's statement that the nonstriking railroad employees accounted for perhaps 150,000 is an appalling and important fact.

Mr. Eckel in a dispatch of yesterday which appeared in the New York Times of today, pointed out that in Pennsylvania the strike had had its strongest economic effect in the closing of major and minor mines, idling at least 7,500 miners, and that the Fretz-Moon Tube Co., a steel fabricating plant, yesterday furloughed 250 employees for lack of steel shipments.

In an article by Robert A. Bedolis, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of May 13, the writer said:

> It was estimated that more than 175,000 workers have been made jobless, including miners in western Pennsylvania and Indiana, where lack of coal cars has closed scores of mines.

Mr. President, I shall not this evening and at this late hour go into detail as to the widespread effect upon industry everywhere along the lines of these various railroads, spreading, as it would have done had it continued, in farther and farther and wider and wider circles. I may have something to say along those lines at a subsequent date. Suffice to say, Mr. Bedolis, as I have indicated, points out that it was estimated that more than 175,000 workers by May 13, which is 3 days before today, had been jobless, including miners in western Pennsylvania and Indiana, to whom he referred.

In a dispatch dated May 12, from Detroit, appearing in the New York Times of May 13, it was stated that the General Motors Corp. announced drastic cutbacks in overtime work, and furloughs for 500 employees in its Fisher Body Plant in Flint; also, that the company had on May 11—and May 11 was only 1 day after the strike had started—laid off 400 employees at its body plant in Grand Rapids.

In a dispatch dated May 12, from Schenectady, appearing in the New York Times of May 13, it was stated that General Electric Co. announced on May 12—which was 2 days after the strike had begun—that the company's plants very shortly will be paralyzed—not merely interfered with, Mr. President, but paralyzed—unless the railroad firemen's strike is settled.

A dispatch of May 12 from Pittsburgh, appearing in the same issue of the New York Times, reads:

> Lack of empty railroad cars raised the total of major coal mine shut-downs to 23 today

in the strike of railroad firemen. The number of small pits that have closed is not known. In all, miners, now idled by the railroad walkout rose to at least 7,500. The daily production loss is estimated at almost 49,000 tons of soft coal.

This was on May 12, only 2 days after the strike had begun.

Mr. President, there sits at this moment in the chair a distinguished friend and colleague of mine, the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL]. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, the Senator quoted a telegram from E. C. Moriarty, stating, among other things, that a trip on which it appears the latter had just arrived in Wichita, Kans., from California on the Santa Fe Chief, one of the two trains then running of the seven California trains which the Santa Fe regularly operates, gave Mr. Moriarty, to quote his vivid language, "a close-up view of the creeping paralysis being imposed on the country by a handful of railroad employees."

Mr. President, if someone should say Mr. Moriarty is gifted with the power of graphic diction and possible exaggeration by terming it "creeping paralysis," I say that an absolute defense to any such charge against him can be shown by the statement from the General Electric Co., to which I have referred, announcing, on the second day after the strike began, that the company's plants very shortly would be paralyzed unless the railroad firemen's strike was settled. The analogy of paralysis is accurate and correct. Every Member of the Senate realizes, and every man of thoughtfulness in the United States will realize and does doubtless realize, that that is the effect of a great industrial strike tying up great portions of the railroad systems of the country.

Mr. President, dispatches introduced into the RECORD on May 15 by my distinguished friend who but a few moments ago requested permission to introduce certain items into the RECORD, the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], indicated the severe losses, and, to quote the author of one of the dispatches presented by the Senator from California, "possible crop disaster," which were threatened by the strike which happily came to an end this morning.

A dispatch appearing in this morning's New York Times pointed out that shortage of supplies because of the railroad strike yesterday caused a reduction of 18 percent in the production of automobiles and trucks at the General Motor Corp.'s Chevrolet and Fisher Body factories at North Tarrytown, N. Y.

These are but illustrations of the effect which the strike was having on our Nation, a strike brought about by a handful of employees of four railroads.

Mr. John G. Forrest, financial editor of the New York Times, in an article appearing therein on May 14, 1950, day before yesterday, said:

> The strike against four of the major railroads, on the question of an additional fireman for Diesel locomotives, caused an immediate curtailment of train schedules. It also affected activities in many industries far removed from railroading.

Then, Mr. President, listen, as the Presiding Officer is so intently listening at this moment, to this language with which Mr. Forrest concludes this paragraph:

> The full impact will be felt more by the automobile, steel, and coal industries than by other groups, but—

And I call the attention of the Senate to this significant language of Mr. Forrest—

> eventually every segment of the Nation will suffer if the strike continues for any length of time.

Mr. President, the people of the United States have indeed good reason to be pleased because the strike has been settled, in view of the inevitable injury to widespread sections of the Nation which would have resulted from a protracted strike.

The settlement, however, does not mean that all labor problems in the railway industry are disposed of. I shall not undertake tonight to recite all these problems. Indeed, I do not know them all, though I have information with respect to some of them which I think would be of interest to the Senate. I do, however, read this significant news article from the Washington Post of March 21, 1950:

> Truman Halts Plan To Strike on 12 Railroads.

I pause to say that the strike to which reference is had in this headline is not the strike which has just been settled. This is one which would be not only upon four railroads, or, including a segment of the Union Pacific, five, this strike, the plan for which the President had halted, was a strike to occur on 12 railroads, if eventualities should bring about the strike.

Let me read the dispatch:

> KEY WEST, FLA., March 20.—President Truman signed an Executive order here today heading off a strike scheduled for tomorrow on 12 western railroads.

Mr. President, I digress to suggest that in all probability there were not 10 Members of the United States Senate who knew at that time that there was a strike scheduled for March 21 on 12 western railroads. It may be that all others but myself knew of it, and if so, I shall withdraw the implication that so many did not, but I have no recollection of ever hearing, until I read this article in the issue of the Washington Post of March 21, that the President had headed off a strike scheduled for that very day, March 21, by signing an Executive order on the day before, thus heading off a strike on 12 western railroads.

Let me read just a little further from the Washington Post article of March 21:

> The President's order set up an emergency board to inquire into a dispute between the carriers and the Switchmen's Union of North America.
>
> The order automatically postpones the strike for 60 days. Personnel of the board is to be named later.

I pause again to pay tribute to the President for the wisdom of his action in signing the Executive order. I also call attention to the fact that the union which was involved or was to be involved in the strike on these 12 western railroads was not the firemen's union, not the union which has been carrying on the strike which was terminated this morning, but another union, the Switchmen's Union of North America.

Let me read further from the article in the Washington Post of March 21 with reference to the 12 railroads and the prospective strike which was scheduled for March 21. The writer continues:

> The railroads are the Chicago Great Western; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific; Davenport, Rock Island & North Western; Denver & Rio Grande; Minneapolis & St. Louis; Great Northern; Northern Pacific Terminal Co. of Oregon; Salt Lake City Union Depot & Railroad Co.; St. Paul Union Depot Co.; Sioux City Terminal Railway Co.; Western Pacific Railroad Co.; and Railway Transfer Co.—city of Minneapolis.
>
> About 4,000 members of the switchmen's union had been poised for a strike Tuesday.

Tuesday was March 21, the day of the issue of the newspaper from which I am quoting. Then the writer concludes:

> The union is asking a 40-hour week without reduction in gross pay for the present 48-hour week.

Mr. President, I am not in any sense, even remotely or impliedly, indicating any views with respect to the merits of the strike that was in prospect. The point I make at this moment is that although the firemen's strike was settled this morning, there was contemplated another strike which was postponed on March 20 for 60 days. If I do not misread the calendar, 60 days from March 20 is approximately May 20, and today is May 16.

Mr. President, let me read a few words from a statement made on May 11, 5 days ago, to a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which was then considering, and is continuing to consider, and I have no doubt will hold subsequent hearings—I trust so—in the near future on a bill now pending before the Senate, namely Senate bill 3463. The statement to which I refer was made by Mr. Daniel P. Loomis. Senators may ask, "Who is Mr. Loomis?" His statement—by the way, he was unable to be present because of the fact that he had important duties in representing railroads in connection with the strike which had been called and was effective on the day before the statement was presented to the subcommittee—was read by Mr. Prince. Mr. Prince, reading from his statement, gave us this information with respect to Mr. Loomis:

> My name is Daniel P. Loomis, and I am chairman of the Association of Western Railways, but I appear here today on behalf of all railroad members of the Association of American Railroads, which comprises practically all of the class I railroads of the United States, and somewhat in excess of 95 percent of the entire railroad industry.

So, Mr. President, the witness, I take it, is obviously qualified by his profession and his connection and his experience to tell us validly and correctly that of which he testified.

I should like to read from the transcript of the testimony thus presented in the statement of Mr. Loomis, which was

read by Mr. Prince as follows—and I quote from page 217 of the multigraphed transcript:

The conductors and trainmen—

They are not the firemen; they are the conductors and trainmen—

have demanded a 40-hour week with wage increases for yardmen and various rules changes for all employees which would also involve wage increases. When negotiations and mediation failed, the organizations threatened to strike, but the President appointed an emergency board which is now investigating the matter.

That board will make its report to the President sometime in June.

I pause, Mr. President, to point out that not only is there in the offing this strike, which would involve 12 railroads, to which the President sent the emergency order on March 20, and we will know apparently sometime around May 20 what will happen with respect to it, but in addition to that, the conductors and trainmen have made the demands to which I have just referred. and the board which the President has appointed will make its report to him sometime in June, and thereafter, Mr. President, with the lapse of an additional 30 days, as I understand the Railway Labor Act, there will be no prohibition, nothing in the world to prevent a strike on behalf of the conductors and trainmen if the parties shall not have come into agreement.

I read further from the testimony of Mr. Loomis, appearing at page 219 of the transcript:

The Switchmen's Union of North America has made similar proposals for a 40-hour week and wage increases for the yardmen it represents and threatened a strike.

I think this is the same controversy to which the Washington Post article of March 21 referred. Let us see what Mr. Loomis tells us about it:

The President named the same Board which was hearing the case of the conductors and trainmen, since the issues were so similar and the employees involved are in the same classes, except that they work on different railroads. The switchmen's union declined to enter into any arrangements to have its request heard before that Board and refused to agree to any extension of time. The Board reported this situation to the President on April 19 and recommended that if the switchmen's union would not agree to any other arrangement the recommendations which the Board will make in the case of the conductors and trainmen should likewise apply to the employees represented by the switchmen's union. Under the Railway Labor Act as it now stands, the 30-day cooling-off period will expire on May 19.

I pause, Mr. President, to say that my computation of approximately May 20 should be altered to state that the end of the period will, as Mr. Loomis points out, take place on May 19 instead of 20.

Continuing, says Mr. Loomis:

The railroads involved include such properties as the Chicago Great Western; Chicago, Rock Island & Pacific; Davenport, Rock Island & North Western; Denver & Rio Grande Western; Great Northern; Minneapolis & St. Louis; Railway Transfer Co. of the City of Minneapolis; Northern Pacific Terminal Co. of Oregon; St. Paul Union Depot Co.; Sioux City Terminal; and Western Pacific.

The Pullman conductors on the Pullman Co. and on the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific have also threatened a strike, but that case is still in mediation.

So, Mr. President, we have a possible strike of the switchmen. We have a possible strike of the conductors and trainmen. Now we have a possible strike of the Pullman conductors, according to Mr. Loomis.

Then I proceed with the following from Mr. Loomis' statement at page 220:

The Railroad Yardmasters of America likewise has a request for a 40-hour week and wage increase and has threatened a strike, but the President has issued an order appointing an emergency board and named the same board which is investigating the conductors' and trainmen's case since those organizations also represent yardmasters. The board has, however, been unable to reach any agreement with the parties on the question of conducting hearings concurrently with the conductors' and trainmen's case, and the report in the case of the yardmasters is due to be filed with the President on May 11.

So, Mr. President, here we are: One strike is settled today, and there is a possibility of a strike by the conductors, a possibility of a strike by the switchmen's union on 12 railroads, a possibility of a strike by the Pullman conductors, a possibility of a strike by the Railroad Yardmasters of America.

I say, therefore, that, notwithstanding the relief which our Nation properly experienced this morning by the announcement which as one individual I heard on my radio as I drove down from my home to the Senate, there are still possibilities in the future which are clouds in the sky, and they may be most ominous and portentous clouds.

Obviously, with the few possible strikes I have indicated, we have the full realization of the fact that, as the days go on, and as the weeks go on, and as the months go on, and as the years go on, controversy after controversy may very easily arise between the employees of railroads and the carriers which will have within them the same threat of strikes which in the case of 1946 and 1948, and then again on May 10, 1950, brought about such conditions as we are all familiar with.

Mr. President, now is the time, not some time long deferred in the hope that all things will improve so thoroughly that there will be no reason for it—now, this time, now is the accepted time for Congress to amend the Railway Labor Act in such manner that any strike or lock-out arising out of or in connection with any dispute falling within the purview of the Railway Labor Act shall be unlawful.

In the Appendix of the RECORD of yesterday there was a very interesting article set forth by Mr. Louis Stark, of the New York Times, the heading of which is sufficient to make the point to which I refer. The heading—I do not know whether Mr. Stark wrote the heading or whether someone else wrote the heading—is this: "Railway Act no longer model for labor laws—Recurring failures to end disputes bring demands for revision."

I say that the facts, as they solemnly confront us at this very moment, indicate that now is the time for Congress to amend the Railway Labor Act in such manner that any strike or lockout arising out of or in connection with any dispute falling within the purview of the Railway Labor Act shall be unlawful.

A moment ago I referred to the article by Mr. Stark. The opening sentence of that article, which is dated May 13, and appears in the New York Times of May 14, occupying a very prominent position in the Sunday issue of the New York Times, and spreading over considerable space—and the article is there set forth in full, reads as follow, as I have indicated by having the article inserted in the Appendix of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

The strike of railroad firemen and enginemen this week focused attention on the weaknesses of the Railway Labor Act and coincided with congressional hearings designed to amend this law so as to make it strikeproof.

It is better, far better, that Congress act, if possible, while a strike is not in progress and while coolness and calmness may more easily prevail.

In this connection, I respectfully call to the attention of the Senate the bill I mentioned a few moments ago, which I introduced on April 21, 1950, namely, Senate bill 3463. That bill amends the Railway Labor Act, as amended, as follows:

First, to provide court review of award or order made by the Adjustment Board—which Board has jurisdiction over disputes between an employee or group of employees and a carrier or carriers growing out of grievances or out of the interpretation or application of agreements concerning rates of pay, rules, or working conditions.

Second, to provide that if the efforts of the Mediation Board under section 5 of the Railway Labor Act to bring about an amicable settlement through mediation shall be unsuccessful, said Board shall at once request in writing the parties to submit their controversy to arbitration and shall thereupon use all reasonable efforts to induce the parties so to do.

Third, to provide that if a dispute between a carrier and its employees, other than a dispute within the jurisdiction of the Adjustment Board, shall not have been adjusted, or arbitration agreed to within 15 days after the Mediation Board shall have requested the parties to submit such dispute to arbitration, the Mediation Board shall immediately so notify the President; that on receipt of such notice the President shall create a Presidential Board to investigate and decide such dispute; that the report of the Presidential Board and the transcript of the proceedings before it, including the evidence, shall be filed with the President and with the Mediation Board and that a report so filed shall, unless set aside in judicial proceedings as in the amendment provided, be conclusive and binding on the parties and enforcible by appropriate proceedings in court.

The bill, in a new section to be known as section 10A, further provides that—

Any strike, including any concerted stoppage of work by employees or any concerted

slow-down, sit-down, walk-out, or other concerted interruption of operations by employees, or any lock-out by a carrier, arising out of or in connection with any dispute falling within the purview of this act, shall be unlawful.

The bill makes it "unlawful for any person, including a carrier or labor organization, (1) to coerce, instigate, induce, or conspire with, any other such person to interfere by any such unlawful strike or lock-out with the operation of any carrier subject to this act; or (2) to participate in, or to aid any such strike interfering with the operation of any such carrier, or to give direction or guidance in the conduct thereof or to further the same by the payment of strike, unemployment, or other benefits to those participating therein; or (3) to aid in any such lock-out interfering with the operation of any such carrier by giving direction or guidance to such lock-out or by providing funds for the conduct or direction thereof."

Mr. President, the bill causes violation of any of the provisions of section 10A to constitute a misdemeanor punishable by the penalties prescribed in paragraph 10 of section 2 of the Railway Labor Act in the case of carriers or their officers or agents for violation of the provisions of that section.

The bill also provides that any United States district court within the territorial jurisdiction of which any violation of section 10A shall have been committed or shall be threatened shall have jurisdiction at the instance of the Attorney General of the United States or the attorney general of any State affected by such violation or a threatened violation of section 10A, or of any interested carrier or aggrieved party, to grant the remedy of injunction, prohibitive or mandatory, which may be appropriate in the premises.

The bill provides details covering the foregoing contents of this statement, including the various judicial proceedings which have been mentioned by me here this evening.

Mr. President, I think it is very interesting to observe the newspaper comments. I hasten to say that I shall not trespass much longer upon the time of the Senate this evening, but I desire to call to the attention of the Senate a significant utterance in the New York Times of today, in what I conclude is its leading editorial or certainly its first editorial, which is entitled "The Railway Strike."

That editorial takes up perhaps three-quarters of a column or certainly a half a column, perhaps I should say, on the editorial page of the New York Times for today.

The concluding paragraph of that editorial reads as follows:

> The present strike may be said to represent the logical culmination of a labor trend that has been in progress on the railroads now for about a decade. More and more the unions have moved in the direction of abiding by the decisions of fact-finding boards only when those decisions were favorable. But if the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1946—

It should be "1947," Mr. President—

> proved anything, it was that sooner or later labor legislation catches up with trends of this kind. If the railroad unions will not accept decisions which are not legally binding—

I call the attention of the Senate to the following statement which is strong and clear and unequivocal—

> then nothing could be more certain than that ultimately they will have to reconcile themselves to a labor-management policy under which decisions will be binding.

That is the gist of Senate bill 3463, the bill which now is pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, ready for its consideration and for its recommendation to this body.

Mr. President, I am very grateful to the few Senators who have so bravely remained this late in the evening to hear these remarks. I offer no apology, however, for trespassing upon the time of any Member of the Senate tonight, because of the fact that in my judgment the subject matter to which I have addressed myself is of such outstanding importance to the welfare of the Nation as to make it imperative that the attention of the Senate shall be directed to the facts to which I have adverted and to the importance of immediate and appropriate action with respect to legislation needed to prevent repetitions of strikes such as that through which we have just gone.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I urge that the Senate do not, because the present strike has been settled, merely heave a sigh of relief and forget the problem until the next recurring difficulty shall arise. Let us proceed without delay to consider and act upon a plan to prevent future labor stoppages in railway operations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of A. Garnett Thompson to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Chester M. Foresman to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess——

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield——

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Is it the intention of the Senator to move that the President be notified of these confirmations?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I shall ask that the President be notified of the action of the Senate confirming the nominations.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. Does the Senator not merely in futuro intend to do so, but does he now ask that the President be notified?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I so ask.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object to notification of the President, I desire to address myself briefly to the subject matter which was considered by me on the 12th of May 1950 on the floor of the Senate. In the first place, the action of notifying the President, if it should be carried out, would constitute a consent that the appointments which have just been confirmed be completed forthwith and that the appointees respectively take office. I called to the attention of the Senate the fact that the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of *United States* v. *Smith* ((286 U. S. 6), loc. cit. 35), said:

> The natural meaning of an order of notification to the President is that the Senate consents that the appointment be forthwith completed and that the appointee take office.

From the announcement by the Chair that, without objection, the President will be notified, or from the action taken upon suggestion or motion such as that made by the distinguished acting majority leader that the President be notified, it is easily possible to arrive at the inference that this is merely in appropriate courtesy to the President. But, Mr. President, by such notification, in fact, not merely is a courtesy extended, but far more than the rendition of a courtesy is accomplished. I pointed out, on May 12, and I quote from column two of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 6967.

> One effect, therefore, of the notification of the President, promptly after confirmation of a nomination, that such confirmation has occurred is to render the Senate powerless to reconsider under its rule XXXVIII its vote advising and consenting to such nomination if, prior to the attempt to reconsider such vote, the resolution of consent shall have been communicated to the President, he shall have signed, and through the Department of State delivered, a commission to the nominee purporting to appoint him the officer to fill the office to which he had been nominated, and the nominee shall have taken the oath of office and undertaken forthwith to discharge the duties of said office.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DONNELL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I understand, then, that the Senator is to object to the notification of the President?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I intend to, in a very short time. But I do not yield further at this time.

The fact that the power of reconsideration is a valuable power was recognized in a most notable piece of litiga-

tion, namely, *United States* v. *Smith* (286 U. S. 6), to which I have referred, which was recognized, and in fact was projected and stated, as I shall indicate in a moment, by the distinguished counsel who represented the United States Senate in that litigation.

Mr. President, the making and execution of such order of notification of the President cuts short the power of reconsideration under the circumstances which I recited a moment ago, and which are the circumstances, in substance, which existed in the case of United States against Smith. I quote further from the remarks which I made on May 12, at page 6967 of the RECORD, as follows:

That the power thus cut short by the making and execution of such order of notification is valuable cannot be doubted. In the argument for the Senate in said case of United States against Smith, it was pointed out, loco citato 11, that the Senate by its rules "formulated the practice of reconsideration in order the better to reach a sound judgment in the confirmation of nominations submitted by it".

I pause to say that that is the statement of counsel for the Senate in the litigation to which I have referred, and this is the precise language of the counsel, used in the argument before the United States Supreme Court. I continue reading from page 6967 of the RECORD of May 12, 1950:

In the sentence in which appears the quoted language the argument for the Senate in said Smith case thereafter employs the words "this valuable power".

I continue to read:

In the United States against Smith case, Mr. John W. Davis, with whom Mr. Alexander J. Groesbeck was on the brief, represented the United States Senate.

I continue to quote from my remarks of May 12:

Not only is the power thus cut short by the making and execution of such order of notification of the President valuable, but in addition the Supreme Court itself stated in the Smith case that notification before the expiration of the period for reconsideration is—to quote loco citato 35—"an exceptional procedure". The Court further pointed out in that case that notification before the expiration of the period for reconsideration—to quote loco citato 35—"may be adopted only by unanimous consent of the Senate".

Mr. President, it is true that although the court referred very appropriately to the fact that the procedure of directing, promptly upon the confirmation, notification of the President is "an exceptional procedure," nevertheless we are all familiar with the fact that the procedure has at least in recent years been followed with great frequency in the Senate; yet, as I have indicated, such procedure not only cuts short a power which is valuable and was so described in behalf of the Senate in argument before the Supreme Court, but is in addition, as the Court itself indicated and said, "an exceptional procedure" which "may be adopted only by unanimous consent of the Senate."

I think the proper time for notification of the President is after the period for reconsideration shall have terminated. And, Mr. President, in order that in the course of my remarks there may appear just what that period is, I ask unanimous consent that there be set forth at this point in my remarks clauses 3 and 4 of rule XXXVIII of the Senate, which relate to the matters under discussion.

There being no objection, clauses 3 and 4 of Senate rule XXXVIII were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

3. When a nomination is confirmed or rejected, any Senator voting in the majority may move for a reconsideration on the same day on which the vote was taken, or on either of the next 2 days of actual executive session of the Senate; but if a notification of the confirmation or rejection of a nomination shall have been sent to the President before the expiration of the time within which a motion to reconsider may be made, the motion to reconsider shall be accompanied by a motion to request the President to return such a notification to the Senate. Any motion to reconsider the vote on a nomination may be laid on the table without prejudice to the nomination, and shall be a final disposition of such motion.

4. Nominations confirmed or rejected by the Senate shall not be returned by the Secretary to the President until the expiration of the time limited for making a motion to reconsider the same, or while a motion to reconsider is pending unless otherwise ordered by the Senate.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, as I have indicated, I do not think we should abdicate this valuable power, a power declared by our own counsel—eminent counsel—to be valuable, nor should we make of an exceptional procedure a frequent and nonexceptional procedure.

So, Mr. President, bearing in mind the importance of the right that the Senate shall have the period prescribed in rule XXXVIII for reconsideration, during which any facts which may come to the attention of the Senate shall not be lost upon the desert air, but be availed of by the Senate, and bearing in mind the other objections to which I have referred this afternoon, I respectfully object to the request made by the acting majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in view of the objection, there is nothing more to do than to let the matter stand as it is.

Mr. DONNELL. Yes.

RECESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 17, 1950, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16 (legislative day of March 29), 1950:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

A. Garnett Thompson to be United States attorney for the southern district of West Virginia.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Chester M. Foresman, to be United States marshal for the district of North Dakota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 16, 1950

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, in all simplicity and sincerity, we are thanking Thee for the gift of life and the blessings of this new day.

Grant that we may meet our tasks and responsibilities courageously and cheerfully, never proving ourselves recreant before any duty or cowardly before any difficulty.

Help us to feel that with the confident assurance of Thy counsel and companionship no task is too arduous, no responsibility too exacting, no trial too great, no sorrow too deep, and no burden too heavy.

When this day comes to a close and the evening shadows fall, may there be within us no vain regrets, no feelings of remorse, and no disturbing memories, but may we have a conscience that is peaceful and a heart that is happy.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 7302) entitled "An act to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. MURRAY, and Mr. BUTLER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MARSALIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes on Thursday next, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

BARTER DEALS WITH COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the membership to a rather serious situation. The following is from the May 13 Washington Farm Reporter:

BARTER

CCC has arranged to barter cotton for soybeans produced in Communist China. The contract, made through a New York export-import firm, calls for exchange of approximately 45,000 bales of cotton for 60,000 tons of Manchurian yellow soybeans.

The beans will be delivered to the Army for use in Japan while the cotton will be

shipped directly to China. USDA reports the Army has stopped buying United States soybeans because the price is too high.

Other barter deals with Communist China are hinted in the official announcement. Officials said the arrangement leaves the way open for exchange of other price-supported commodities for soybeans or other products.

Mr. Fred Bailey, editor of the Farm Reporter, is a reliable source of agricultural information and is so regarded nationally. I have also checked with the CCC and am assured of the facts.

The points I wish to make are:

First. That President Truman told the American people in Washington State last week about the horrors of the famine and the starvation in China. While he was making this speech, in which he indicated help for the Chinese, his administration's agency was helping to starve additional Chinese. Soybeans are a human food product in China.

Second. The second point is that while we may not recognize China officially, it is evident this administration is willing and has recognized China commercially.

I ask in all seriousness, does this procedure make sense to you from a human standpoint?

I realize the power and force of cotton. However, it is morally wrong to follow this path. From all reports the Russians will and have exacted sufficient food from China without our country adding to a most distressing situation.

We have arrived at a serious point when we are a party to adding misery to a people in order to dispose of a few bales of cotton.

THE LATE HONORABLE EVERETT SANDERS

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I requested unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute in order that I may pay tribute to a former Member of this body, the Honorable Everett Sanders, of Terre Haute, Ind.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Indiana today mourns the passing of one of its most illustrious sons, the Honorable Everett Sanders, of Terre Haute, whose sudden passing on the afternoon of May 12 came as a shock to all who knew and loved him.

It seems fitting and proper that the House of Representatives today should pay tribute to Everett Sanders, for he was, for many years, actively associated with this body, both as a Member and, later, as secretary to a President of the United States, the Honorable Calvin Coolidge.

Everett Sanders was born, one of a large family, in humble circumstances. He rose to become a four-term Member of Congress, and a confidant of the most influential men in this great Nation during the administrations of Presidents Coolidge and Herbert Hoover.

As a young man, he taught school before attending the normal school of Terre Haute, Ind. He received a law degree at Indiana University in 1907 and 9 years later, in 1916, was elected to Congress from the old Indiana Fifth District, parts of which today are in the district I have the honor to represent.

For four terms, Everett Sanders served his constituency and served it well. He served on the Interstate Commerce Committee and conducted hearings on the return of the railroads to private management after World War I.

At the conclusion of his fourth term in 1924, he declined to seek reelection and, instead, became chairman of the Speakers' Bureau for the Republican National Committee.

At the conclusion of the successful 1924 Presidential campaign, Mr. Sanders was invited to serve as secretary to President Coolidge, a position which won him the further respect of the membership of the Congress.

He was elected chairman of the Republican National Committee and held that position until the conclusion of the 1932 Presidential campaign.

Retiring from active participation in the political arena, Mr. Sanders devoted the remainder of an illustrious career to the practice of law here in the District of Columbia.

His earthly career ended when he passed away at his desk last Friday at the age of 68. Burial services are being conducted this afternoon in Terre Haute.

We extend our deepest and sincerest sympathy to Mrs. Sanders and the family.

In the words of the Hoosier poet, James Whitcomb Riley, "He is not dead, he is just away," and his sterling characteristics, his many acts of kindness, his great influence and devotion to his family, State and Nation will long be remembered.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I join in paying respect to the memory of the finest man I ever have had the privilege of knowing. On last Friday afternoon we were shocked at learning of the passing of Everett Sanders, a former Member of the House of Representatives, and a sincere, honest, upright, and courageous citizen. To many of us, he is particularly remembered for his kindly and gentle nature, and for his spirit of helpfulness. As for myself, I think I found in him about all the attributes that are to be found in any one individual.

These words of mine are not stereotyped expressions which one might utter of any casual acquaintance. They are sincere and coming from the heart, because I knew Everett Sanders and was a beneficiary of his many kindnesses.

Always, to me, he was kindly and helpful. I well recall when I first came to Congress in 1935, and knew very few people in Washington. I was not a little concerned about the responsibilities that confronted me, and many of you can well appreciate the appearance of a friend at such a time. Such a friend I found in Everett Sanders, who was one of the first persons who came to my office to offer his help.

Throughout the years since that time our friendship continued. Everett Sanders was most helpful in many ways. Often have I been a guest in his home, with him and his good wife. We Hoosiers always liked to go to see them, because they were just the sort of folks that we like to think of as true, real Hoosiers.

Certainly the State of Indiana has lost a great citizen, and the Nation has lost a great citizen. We all join in mourning his passing.

Mrs. HARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the lady yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, with the probable exception of the Speaker and my distinguished friend from Georgia, Mr. Cox, I am the only Member on the floor on our side of the House at this moment who served with Everett Sanders.

When I came to the Sixty-seventh Congress Mr. Sanders was one of the parliamentary leaders on the Republican side. The friendships that grow up between members of different parties in this body have been referred to as the flowers that overhang the walls of party politics.

I learned to admire the ability, the courage, the energy, and the real Americanism, if you please, of Everett Sanders while he was a Member of this body at a time when we had some of the hardest battles that I have ever gone through. I also knew him when he was secretary to President Coolidge, and I have known him ever since. He was one of the finest men I have ever met.

His death is a great loss to this country, as well as to his home State of Indiana.

When I think of Everett Sanders I can see such men as James R. Mann, Frank Mondell, Nicholas Longworth, Claude Kitchen, Ben Humphreys, Henry Rainey, and the troops of others who have now passed to the Great Beyond, in the words of Thomas Moore—

> I feel like one
> Who treads alone
> Some banquet hall deserted,
> Whose lights are fled,
> Whose garlands dead,
> And all but he departed.

Mrs. HARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I join with the members of the Indiana delegation in this tribute to an old personal friend, a distinguished public servant and a great American. It was my privilege to know Everett Sanders shortly before I came to Congress. He was identified with those of us interested in the renomination of President Coolidge.

Ever since I have known Everett Sanders through all these intervening years as a man of outstanding ability, a man of courage, a man whose devotion to his country was never exceeded by any individual, Everett Sanders could well be

the theme of a Horatio Alger story. Born of humble parents, born under circumstances in which he had to make unaided his own battle to get ahead in the world, he succeeded and slowly climbed the ladder of success until he became the confidant of a great President of the United States, Mr. Coolidge. During all this period of struggle he never lost the common touch; he was kind; he was humble. He never failed to appreciate those who had helped him and had been associated with him in his long climb from a humble Hoosier boy to his high position in the councils of the great.

So, as one who enjoyed his personal friendship, I know the great loss that has come, not only to Indiana but to his legion of friends and to the country. To his family I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mrs. HARDEN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. I join with thousands of Hoosier friends and friends from all over the Nation, as well as friends throughout the world, in mourning the passing of a great Hoosier, Everett Sanders.

Everett Sanders was typical of all that is America. Only in America today can people rise from the humble circumstances and environment in which Everett Sanders grew up. He was born in a log cabin in Clay County. He worked his way through college and rose to the position of Representative in the Congress of the United States and secretary to the great President Calvin Coolidge.

Everett Sanders, on arriving in Washington to serve his first term, cast his first vote in this House of Representatives for a declaration of war against Germany. Everett Sanders also was the man to whom President Calvin Coolidge scribbled the little note, "I do not choose to run," in answer to the press inquiry, "Will you run for the presidency in 1928?"

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY. Everett Sanders served his country well; and, both in the Congress of the United States and as secretary to former President Coolidge he contributed much not only to the reconstruction period of the country following World War I, but also to the great industrial expansion period that was coincident. His death marks the passing of a great American. All of us in the House, I am sure, extend our sympathy to his widow and surviving brother.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from Indiana yield?

Mrs. HARDEN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I, too, would like to pay my tribute to Everett Sanders, a great Hoosier. Indiana has sent many fine men and women to Congress. Everett Sanders was one of the finest. I knew him well and saw him frequently, especially when he was secretary to President Coolidge. I saw him on many matters of the district and my State, and matters concerning disabled veterans when I was the President's personal representative in care of disabled veterans. Everett Sanders was a great man, a great American. So many have spoken of his kindliness; I remember when I called the White House about things that he felt the President might not want to consider, although often the President did. I remember his helpfulness and his regret if things could not be accomplished but he helped accomplish many things. President Calvin Coolidge said he was a perfect Presidential secretary. Many others shared that view. What more can be said of anyone than to be loyal to one's chief, to be loyal to the President of the United States, to be loyal to one's country? America is much richer because of his noble life and example. I send my deepest sympathy to his gracious widow.

Mrs. HARDEN. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the life and character of Everett Sanders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, Everett Sanders was a real man—one of splendid ability. In the writings of President Coolidge he stated that in the appointment of Mr. Sanders he had chosen a man of great ability. In that statement he was correct for Sanders was a man of great ability and a great citizen. We need many men of his type today.

CAMPAIGN ADVICE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday our former colleague and my distinguished personal friend, Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, advised his fellow Democrats to fight in the coming campaign with their backs to the wall, with guns smoking hot, and colors nailed to the mast.

Without premeditation the famous Gridiron Club that evening, Saturday night, in a skit entitled "Happy Harry's Carnival," had the Kansas City Kid, to the tune of Everything's Up to Date in Kansas City, from the musicale Oklahoma, sing:

We got it figgered out in Kansas City,
From Pendergast we learned a thing or two,
O' diff'runt ways there is fer votin' double,
As pistol-packin' Democrats can do.
We settle all the arguments with our forty-fives,
Never have to worry nor to chafe;
'Taint no trick at all to control the City Hall,
If you know the combination to the safe.

Everything's up to date in Kansas City,
We've gone about as fur as we can go;
They never seem to dope it out, even the FBI,
How Democrats are takin' in all the dough.
Everything's going swell in Kansas City,
Republicans will never have a show;
We got a nifty system there whenever the people vote,
A special way of countin', but it ain't the way you wrote;
We're careful to apologize before we cut your throat,
We've gone about as fur as we can go.

Seemingly the top-flight newspapermen of Washington, who make up the Gridiron Club, are just as aware as most Republicans that the 19 unsolved gangland murders in Kansas City during the past 5 years, and the stealing of the ballots of a corrupt election from the courthouse vault, were both most instrumental in permitting the Pendergast machine, one of the cornerstones upon which the present Democratic administration is based, to remain in power.

We hope, however, Senator ANDERSON was not suggesting that in the 1950 campaign the whole Nation be subjected to the smoking pistol ballot-stealing technique which has maintained the corrupt Pendergast machine and the Democratic Party in control of Kansas City for so many years.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S REPORT TO THE NATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of riding with the President through the State of Montana last week. The President in his official capacity was making a report to the people of the Nation. In other words he was going home because home for him is all 48 States.

He traveled through the East and the Midwest, he traveled through the Teapot Dome country, he traveled up into Washington, and across Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and ended up in Illinois where, if my memory serves me correctly, the last Republican Governor had a good many newspapermen on the State payroll. I think it was a good thing for the President to go to that part of the country and report to the people.

His receptions were tremendous and the people loved the Chief Executive who came to see them—and to be seen. It is my hope that the President will, at least once a year, travel throughout our country and make a first-hand report to his constituents—the people of the United States.

THE PENNSYLVANIA PRIMARY

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening I was driving through my district to go to Columbiana, Ohio, one of the cities in my district. Imagine my amazement when from the loud speaker of the radio of my car came the voice

of ex-Governor James, of Pennsylvania. He was telling about the corruption and the thievery that has been going on in the State of Pennsylvania, and he named some names.

Among other things, he said that Judge Fine, who is one of the candidates in today's primary up there, had been a judge in one of the most corrupt counties in Pennsylvania, a county that had been alive with gangsters and racketeers for so long that if nominated charges would be brought against him which would prevent his election or his taking office if elected. He also had some very uncomplimentary things to say about the present Governor of Pennsylvania, Governor Duff, and what a tragic mistake it would be to elect a man of his unsavory reputation to the United States Senate.

I am very much interested in seeing just exactly what the Republicans in Pennsylvania will do today, how they will explain this away when they have nominated Governor Duff or Judge Fine.

POLITICS

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] as usual injected a little politics when he quoted from the Gridiron Club dinner. I am at this time looking at a news report on the same dinner which appeared in last Sunday's New York Times, and I find there the following:

GOP RAIN MAKER TURNS OUT A FROST

In the rain-making machine skit Republican leaders were gathered on a New Mexico desert. Finding that a machine could make rain by shooting dry ice into the clouds, they wondered if Republican votes could be gained by firing dry speeches into the air.

I had no idea of the ability of the Republicans to produce such a strange machine. I quote from one of the songs in this act:

Our party's faced a barren waste
without a taste of water;
Cool water.
With might and main, we'll try for rain,
so we can gain the voter;
Cool, cool voter.

At the close of the number the remarkable Rube Goldberg machine rained snow, instead of votes.

THE EIGHTIETH CONGRESS

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I listened last evening with quite a lot of interest and some enthusiasm to the speech of President Truman in Chicago, in which he referred to the Eightieth Congress as an old-fashioned, backward-looking Congress.

I have to admit that we were guilty of being a little bit old-fashioned and a little bit backward-looking, because that Eightieth Congress for the first time in 18 years balanced the budget, reduced taxes, and paid some on the national debt.

If to be forward-looking and progressive is to fight a bloody war at the expense of three or four hundred billion dollars and several hundred thousand lives, and to lose the peace after that war is fought, then I plead guilty to having been a Member of that backward-looking, old-fashioned Eightieth Congress. I hope I may never be a Member of any Congress which repeats the acts of the Democratic Congresses of the 16 years preceding that Eightieth Congress.

THE CAPONE MOB

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] told us about the President's nonpolitical trip and the various places he visited. He said the President ended up in Chicago.

That was at the Democratic rally. It might be well if he ended there and did not bother us any more down here.

Chicago is a fitting place. Maybe some of you remember that Capone mob of Chicago that extorted something over a million dollars from the members of unions, working people, and then were convicted and sent to prison. Finally one of the President's friends, Mr. Dillon, came up from St. Louis and attended hearings at Chicago.

He visited the White House—social visits, he said. Dillon managed the President's campaign when he was a candidate for Senator. This is all according to Dillon's own testimony. It is all sworn testimony in the record.

Then Tom Clark was seen, and Tom Clark had a boyhood friend named Hughes. Hughes is the fellow who in New York was handed by an unknown 14 $1,000 bills.

The ultimate result of the activities of Tom Clark in dismissing the indictment that was pending against the Capone mobsters and of Mr. Dillon and Mr. Hughes was to free those mobsters.

I hope the President had a pleasant visit with those three, at least, who are still out of the penitentiary.

PENNSYLVANIA PRIMARIES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have before me the New York Times of May 8, 1950, not May 8, 1900, as most Republican leaders think today. I quote:

A small group of old fogies, sourpuss fakers—

Strong language—

out of touch with the people—

Significant language—

but with a lot of money—

Note that, now, with a lot of money—

are doing everything in their power to force on the party their own hand-picked candidates.

That is not a Democrat making that statement, it is a Republican, Governor Duff, of Pennsylvania, in commenting about Mr. Grundy. That is the best evidence possible, a Republican governor using that language and referring to his own party in Pennsylvania.

The whole country is laughing in glee at the discomfort of our Republican friends in Congress, not the Republicans in the home, because they are far ahead of the Republicans in Congress, except a few who have progressive ideas; the whole country is laughing in glee at the discomfort the President has given the Republican Party in this Congress by his trip to meet the people. If there is one thing the American people like, it is a President who is close to them. They liked Theodore Roosevelt when he went around the country. Even then the Republican leaders and the Republican press tried to knock him down when he went around for a square deal for the people and fighting the trusts. They termed him then as wielding a big stick.

Theodore Roosevelt is remembered because he was close to the people. The Republican leadership in Congress does not like to see a President keeping close to the people. Of course, President Truman, by being and remaining close to the people has caused the Republican leadership a great deal of mental distress.

TWO ROCK UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4732) to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock Union school district, a political subdivision of the State of California, in Sonoma County, Calif., and to furnish said school district water, free of charge, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 7, strike out "not to exceed" and insert "equivalent to."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to direct the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the Two Rock Union school district, a political subdivision of the State of California, in Sonoma County, Calif., and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETROCESSION OVER CERTAIN LAND IN SHIRLEY, MASS.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4433) to make retrocession to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts over certain land in Shirley, Mass., with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "of 1947."

Page 2, line 3, after "1600", insert "of 1947."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING COMMISSIONED OFFICERS OF ARMED FORCES TO ADMINISTER CERTAIN OATHS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6171) to authorize commissioned officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps to administer certain oaths, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after "component" down to and including "States," in line 6 and insert "(including the reserve component) of any of the armed forces of the United States."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an oration.

Mr. KARST asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an article.

Mr. TAURIELLO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement from the National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. WIER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a resolution expressing concern over the policy of our country in the Middle East.

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio (at the request of Mr. JENKINS) was given permission to extend her remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. LEFEVRE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE asked and was given permission to extend her own remarks.

Mr. KEATING asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks.

Mr. MANSFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include newspaper articles and also the speeches of the President of the United States in the State of Montana.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a statement.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in four instances and include extraneous matter in each.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

GLADYS J. SENYOHL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2234) for the relief of Gladys J. Senyohl.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

GRANTING PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 187) favoring the granting of the status of permanent resident to certain aliens.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

ALEXANDER STEWART

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1991) for the relief of Alexander Stewart.

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

CATHRYN A. GLESENER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 469) for the relief of Cathryn A. Glesener.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cathryn A. Glesener, of Underwood, Wash., the sum of $36,441, with interest at 4½ percent from January 1, 1938, to the date of enactment of this act, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for compensation for (1) the destruction of a log wharf and boom on the north side of, and extending into, the Columbia River, near Underwood, Wash., by the United States engineers in 1937 in connection with the construction of the Bonneville Dam; (2) losses incurred by reason of the depreciation in value of shore property, improvements and facilities as a result of the destruction of such log wharf and boom; and (3) loss of earnings as a result of the destruction of such log wharf and boom and the loss of business from 1935 to 1937, inclusive, while the Bonneville Dam was under construction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN P. HAYES, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2229) for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster; Peter J. Grant, assistant postmaster; William W. Crist, superintendent of money orders; and John S. Bantham, station examiner, at Albany, N. Y.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John P. Hayes, postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $362.54; that Peter J. Grant, assistant postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $219.18; that William W. Crist, superintendent of money orders at the Albany, N. Y., post office, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $186.31; that John S. Bantham, station examiner at the Albany, N. Y., post office, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $165.86. Such sums represent a shortage at the Albany post office due to the embezzlement of postal funds by a former clerk in the money-order section of that post office who has been convicted and sentenced to imprisonment for such embezzlement. The Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of John P. Hayes in the sum of $362.54, the account of Peter J. Grant in the sum of $219.18, the account of William W. Crist in the sum of $186.31, and the account of John S. Bantham in the sum of $165.86. The surety on the bond of said postal employees is released from any liability on account of such shortage $933.89.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1 line 5, strike out $362.54" and insert "$933.89."

Page 1, line 5, after the figures strike out "; that Peter J. Grant, assistant postmaster at Albany, N. Y., is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $219.18; that William W. Crist, superintendent of money orders at the Albany, N. Y.,

post office, is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $186.31; that John S. Bantham, station examiner at the Albany, N. Y., post office is relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $165.86", and insert a period.

Page 2, line 10, strike out all after the sign "$", and insert "933.89."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of John P. Hayes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL J. D. MARSHALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2535) for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act for the relief of Samuel J. D. Marshall," approved December 23, 1943 (57 Stat. 718), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Samuel J. D. Marshall, a sum equal to any money paid by him or withheld from him as a partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States arising by reason of such alleged shortage."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel J. D. Marshall, of Sewell, N. J., a sum equal to 1 year's pay, at the rate he was receiving when discharged from the Army on December 15, 1922, as computed by the Comptroller General of the United States, to which sum he was entitled under the act of June 30, 1922 (42 Stat. 716), as amended by the act of September 14, 1922 (42 Stat. 840): *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY C. GOAKES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3007) for the relief of Harry C. Goakes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harry C. Goakes, Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $3,194.61. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Harry C. Goakes against the United States arising out of the loss of personal property owned by him when the vessel *Rio de la Plata* sank off the coast of Mexico in August 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM A. CROSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3535) for the relief of William A. Cross.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $894.75 to William A. Cross, of Needham, Mass., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement of expenses incurred for private medical and hospital treatment while on authorized absence from duty as an enlisted man of the Army during the period from April 4, 1942, to April 25, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREAT AMERICAN INDEMNITY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4140) for the relief of the Great American Indemnity Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Great American Indemnity Co., New York, N. Y., the sum of $651.34. Such sum represents reimbursement for a like amount paid by such company to cover claims for compensation for personal injuries incurred by three employees of the Clarke-Halawa Rock Co., Honolulu, T. H., resulting from a collision in Honolulu, on September 1, 1944, between a truck, owned by the Clarke-Halawa Rock Co. and in which such employees were riding, and a jeep driven by a member of the United States Marine Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CLARENCE F. MOORE, ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4364) for the relief of Mrs. Clarence F. Moore; John Robert Lusk III; J. R. Lusk, Sr.; Gertrude Elizabeth Lusk; Mrs. Willie Pruitt; and Mrs. Billie John Bickle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000 to Mrs. Clarence F. Moore, the former wife of J. R. Lusk, Jr., deceased; and the sum of $5,000 to the minor, John Robert Lusk III, son of J. R. Lusk, Jr., deceased; and the sum of $5,000 to J. R. Lusk, Sr., and Gertrude Elizabeth Lusk, the father and mother of J. R. Lusk, Jr., deceased, in full settlement of all claims they have against the United States for the death of J. R. Lusk, Jr., and to pay the sum of $15,000 to Mrs. Willie Pruitt, the former wife of Ernest W. Tillinghast, and the sum of $5,000 to Billie John Bickle, daughter of Ernest W. Tillinghast, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Ernest W. Tillinghast, and for personal injuries and hospital and medical expenses of Mrs. Willie Pruitt sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle near Blanco, Blanco County, Tex., on January 10, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert "That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,500 to Mrs. Ruth B. Moore (formerly Mrs. John R. Lusk, Jr.), of Dallas, Tex., and the sum of $5,000 to the legal guardian of John Robert Lusk III, of Dallas, Tex., the minor son of John R. Lusk, Jr., deceased, on account of the death of the said John R. Lusk, Jr.; the sum of $135 to John R. Lusk, Sr., of Ballinger, Tex., for the expenses incurred by him in connection with the burial of the said John R. Lusk, Jr.; the sum of $6,500 to Mrs. Minnie P. Pruitt (formerly Mrs. Ernest W. Tillinghast), of Colorado City, Tex., on account of the death of Ernest W. Tillinghast and expenses incurred by her as the result of his injury and death, and for the property damage and personal injuries sustained by her, including the medical and hospital expenses incurred by her as the result of her injury; and the sum of $5,000 to Mrs. Billie John Bickle, of Hamilton, Tex., on account of the death of her father, Ernest W. Tillinghast, in full settlement of all claims of said parties against the United States arising out of an accident involving a United States Army truck, which occurred near Blanco, Blanco County, Tex., on January 10, 1941: *Provided*,."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ruth B. Moore; John Robert Lusk III; John R. Lusk, Sr.; Mrs. Minnie P. Pruitt; and Mrs. Billie John Bickle."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BERNARD F. ELMERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4803) for the relief of Bernard F. Elmers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bernard F. Elmers, Pleasant Plains, N. Y., the sum of $12,500, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him on July 8, 1947, when he was assaulted and robbed by unknown assailants while employed as a civilian employee of the Army Exchange Service, to wit, a junior auditor, serving with the Army in Germany: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZABETH H. WHITNEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4960) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth H. Whitney.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Elizabeth H. Whitney, of Winchester, Mass., the sum of $3,589.74. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mrs. Elizabeth H. Whitney against the United States arising out of the death, on February 3, 1947, of her husband, Lt. Charles A. Whitney, Jr., United States Naval Reserve, serial No. 361256, for 6 months death gratuity, for compensation for medical expenses incurred, and for the difference between active-duty pay and retired pay from the date of his separation from the service to the date of his death: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,589.74" and insert "$2,559.20."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. M. TINDAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5252) for the relief of W. M. Tindal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,343.53 to W. M. Tindal, of Neeses, S. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle, near Tillman, S. C., on October 29, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACME FINANCE CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5799) for the relief of the Acme Finance Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Acme Finance Co., Colorado, the sum of $864.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such Acme Finance Co. against the United States arising out of the loss of such Acme Finance Co.'s equity in a 1941 model Mercury automobile (motor No. 99A-385413) when such automobile was confiscated in connection with its use in transporting altered currency: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "Company," insert "Denver."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL E. ROCKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6416) for the relief of Paul E. Rocke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul E. Rocke, Warren, Ohio, the sum of $373. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul E. Rocke against the United States for property damage sustained on May 3, 1946, when an Army reconnaissance car, driven by a soldier who was using such car without authority, ran into the automobile of the said Paul E. Rocke which was properly parked on Market Street, Warren, Ohio: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWIN F. ROUNDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6644) for the relief of Edwin F. Rounds.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edwin F. Rounds, of Sundance, Wyo., the sum of $330.18. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Edwin F. Rounds against the United States arising out of his selling supplies on credit to Roland Williams, an Army contractor, at the request of Army officers, in February 1949. Although Army officers assured the said Edwin F. Rounds that he would be paid for the supplies out of money due the contractor from the United States, and arranged an assignment for that purpose, the assignment was later declared invalid and the contractor was paid in full, but the said Edwin F. Rounds was not paid the purchase price of the supplies: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

D. C. HALL MOTOR TRANSPORTATION

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7991) for the relief of D. C. Hall Motor Transportation.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to D. C. Hall Motor Transportation, Fort Worth, Tex., the sum of $7,551.17. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said D. C. Hall Motor Transportation against the United States arising out of the collision near Leland, Miss., on December 11, 1945, of a United States Army truck (which was being operated in a negligent manner by an Army enlisted man who was using the vehicle without authority) with a truck and trailer belonging to the said D. C. Hall Motor Transportation and being operated with due care: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on

account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,551.17" and insert "$7,107.17."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM B. BUOL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2225) for the relief of William B. Buol.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws of the United States, the first proviso to section 3 (a) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended (U. S. C., title 50, War, Appendix, sec. 303 (a)), shall not be held to apply to William B. Buol, of Winona, Minn.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, insert:

"SEC. 2. The Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of William B. Buol, as of May 23, 1940, the date on which he legally entered the United States; and the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Swiss quota of the first year that the Swiss quota is hereafter available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA GEERTRIUDE MULDERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2766) for the relief of Maria Geertriude Mulders.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Maria Geertriude Mulders, of Crescent City, Calif., who was admitted into the United States on a visitor's visa, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of June 10, 1947.

SEC. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available quota for nationals of the Netherlands.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUK ONN WON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3805) for the relief of Yuk Onn Won.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to cause an immigration visa to be issued to Yuk Onn Won, the adopted son of Kui Fat Won and Margaret Choy Keau Ching Won, husband and wife, American citizens and residents of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii, if he is found by the United States consul to whom application for visa is made to be admissible under all the provisions of the immigration laws other than the Quota Act of May 26, 1924. Upon his admission to the United States, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provisions of section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, pertaining to unmarried children under 21 years of age of a citizen of the United States, shall be held to be applicable to the alien Yuk Onn Won; and the said Yuk Onn Won shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Kui Fat Won and Margaret Choy Keau Ching Won, United States citizens and residents of Honolulu, Territory of Hawaii."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA GRAZIA RICCIO DiPIETRO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5221) for the relief of Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro, a naturalized citizen of the United States who lost citizenship of the United States by voting in an Italian election in 1946 may be naturalized by taking, prior to 1 year from the enactment of this act, before any naturalization court specified in subsection (a) of section 301 of the Nationality Act of 1940, as amended, or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 335 of the said act.

(b) From and after naturalization under this act, Mrs. Maria Grazia Riccio DiPietro shall have the same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALFIO BATELLI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5947) for the relief of Alfio Batelli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General of the United States shall record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Alfio Batelli as of September 5, 1947, the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHENG SICK YUEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6066) for the relief of Cheng Sick Yuen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Cheng Sick Yuen shall be considered to be the natural-born son of American veteran of World War II, Larry Cheng, and his wife, Mrs. Larry Cheng.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, notwithstanding the quota limitations now provided by law, a quota immigration visa may be issued to Cheng Sick Yuen, minor adopted child of Keung Jack Cheng (Larry Cheng), a naturalized citizen of the United States, provided the said Cheng Sick Yuen is otherwise admissible to the United States under the immigration laws.

"SEC. 2. Upon the issuance of such visa, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Chinese racial quota for the first year such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAIJIRO YOSHIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7315) for the relief of Daijiro Yoshida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Daijiro Yoshida, minor son of Suzuko Yoshida, an American citizen, and that the said Daijiro Yoshida may be permitted to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIE MARGARETA RIES ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7564) for the relief of Maria Margareta Ries and Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any provisions of the immigration laws or other laws relating to entry into the United States, the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to admit into the United States for permanent residence Maria Margareta Ries, who is the financée of Kenneth H. Headrick, a citizen of the United States, and their minor child, Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries. The Secretary of State shall thereupon direct the proper quota control officer to deduct two numbers from the German quota for the first year said quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws Maria Margareta Ries may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Maria Margareta Ries is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to Kenneth H. Headrick, a United States citizen, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the imigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Maria Margareta Ries, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Maria Margareta Ries, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Maria Margareta Ries as of the date of her entry into the United States upon the payment by her of the required fees and head taxes.

"SEC. 2. The provisions of section 4 (a) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, pertaining to unmarried children under 21 years of age of a citizen of the United States shall be held to be applicable to Konrad Horst Wilhelm Ries, minor child of Kenneth H. Headrick, a citizen of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-6984669, Abrahamson, Karen Elizabeth (nee Thompson).

A-6313428, Anaya, Maria De La Luz, or Concepcion Rodriguez.

A-5325046, Andreanchich, Giachino, or Jim Andren.

A-4767186, Asapansa-Johnson, Josephus Milton, or Comma, Asapansa-Johnson.

A-6171450, Bageris, Helen George or Bagheris (nee Alexopoulou).

A-6409853, Barron-Juraez, Angel, or Angel Barron.

A-2299741, Bournais, Eleftherios, or Elifterios or Louis Terry or Louis George Bournias.

A-6323045, Camacho, Cresencio Pesina.

A-5330164, Campo, Sebastian, or Sebastian Campa.

A-2439084, Casella, Maria Angela, maiden name Fasciani, former marriage D'Amore or Maria Angela Trato.

A-2734730, Chiu, Chen Sung, or Chui Chen Sung or Sung Chui Chen.

A-2734733, Chen, Hsui-Hua (nee Wu).

A-5546379, Chow, Che Keung.

A-5096710, Ciccone, Maria (nee De Martino or Maria Pastafina or Maria Villano or Roza Puma or Parente or Jennie Esposito or Jenni Capuana).

A-5802945, Cosman, George William or Kosman, George William or Gregory or Casman, George William.

A-5257536, Da Silva, Francisco Honorato.

A-6359674, De Cortez, Felicitas Moreno, or Felicitas Moreno-Escobedo.

A-3199498, De Guzman, Maria Encarnacion Gutierrez, or Encarnacion Gutierrez De Guzman or Encarnacion Arroyo.

A-6678250, Delegeorge, George Thomas, or George Athamasios Delegeorge or Georgios Deligeorgis.

A-2265366, De Trejo, Concepcion Gonzalez Vda.

A-4644006, Diaz, Jose Maria.

A-3386208, D'Onofrio, Loretta (nee Penna).

A-6758013, Dulak, Josefa.

A-6363826, Economou, Venizelos.

A-5910166, Erbe, Emilie Franziska, or Emmy Erbe.

A-6299823, Evangelos, Despina.

A-9632385, Fadl, Mostafa Ahmad Aboud, or Ahmed Mostapa Fadl or Ahmed Mustapha Fadl or Ahmed Musthapah Fadl or Ahmed Mistafa Fadl.

A-4396077, Felif, Alphus Jeremiah Strickland, or Alpheus Jeremiah Felix.

A-5244319, Fiebiger, Babette Hacker (nee Babette Hacker).

A-5455041, Flores, Silvestre, or Angel Silvestre Flores or Crescencio Reza or Soltero Delfin or Crescencio Reva or Jose Marquez.

A-3215985, Foster, Henry, or Harry Foster.

A-4316224, Garcia, Francisca Mendez, or Francisca Mendez.

A-5438264, Glatzel, Ferdinand Salvatore.

A-3295926, Ging, Neng Shwen, or Neng Swen Ging (alias Nelson Ging).

A-5722749, Glikis, Traintafilos, or Ross Glikis.

A-5973526, Gurrobat, Thomas Gianan.

A-4084838, Hurowitz, Sam (alias Owsej Urowecz or Owziej Urowicz).

A-6283201, Hutchinson, George Earl Wilfred, or George Wilfred Hutchinson.

A-6277526, Jahren, Signe Marie, or Signe Jahren Valentino.

A-5320911, Jurjan, Sybill, or Sibilie Z'hie (nee Stankevitz).

A-1089454, Karaviotis, Ioannis, or John Karas.

A-3597193, Lawyer, Eric Sorabji, or Erachsaw Sorabji Lawyer.

A-5998781, Leahey, Suzanne, or Suzzane Krausz or Suzanne De Body or Suzanne De Strasser or Suzanne Bernstein.

A-3429868, Lehr, Fridolf Alarik, or Fridolf Lihr.

A-9776950, Limberator, Iraklis Panagiotis, or Hercules Limberatos or Iraklis Libby.

A-3400353, Lorenzo, Manuel Alvarez, or Manuel Alvarez.

A-1373722, Maneiro, Manuel Arcos.

A-6185632, Marcoida, Juan Hoyos.

A-6829451, Mata, Luis, or Louis Mata.

A-1737124, Metaxas, Kleanthis Dionysios.

A-6268702, Muntean, Cornelia Filip.

A-6268703, Muntean, Stella or Steluta.

A-5966968, Mykulak, Peter.

A-3054661, Nakamura, Chieko or Chiye.

A-3444333, Nielsen, Dagmar Charlotte (nee Sander formerly Henriksen).

A-4211025, Pappargyris, George Nicholas, or Georgios Nicholas Pappargyris.

A-4961418, Pearson, Dudley Augustas, or Dudley Pearson.

A-1319046, Pedersen, Jens Peder Albinus, or Jens Pedersen.

A-5110903, Perhaus, Carlo Mario.

A-5263012, Petrincich, Francesco.

A-4441864, Pohl, Heinrich August.

A-6316336, Pontarolo, Ellen Laura (nee Gillanders or Ellen Laura McMurry or Ellen Laura Vonkeister).

A-7043063, Railton, Susan Ann, or Sarah Virginia Railton.

A-7043064, Railton, Timothy John Reid.

A-3460108, Rasso, Carmen Mary Ramirez, or Carmen M. Ramirez.

A-7030531, Rasso, Alfredo N., or J. Alfredo Rasso.

A-4894010, Root, Jeanne Rose (nee Jeanne Rose Albinelli).

A-4909124, Rosi, Cleofe, or Mario Rose.

A-4056177, Rouse, Herbert Newton.

A-6389239, Samuels, Frances Louise, or Frances Louisa Samuels (alias Franca Luisa Sparano or Franca Sparano).

A-5968589, Samuray, Salih Behcet.

A-6131542, Saucedo, Alfonso Campusano, or Alfonso Saucedo.

A-6877591, Schmitt, Fraser Jasper.

A-5107271, Seoane, Eugenio, or Eugenio Calvo Seoane.

A-3015787, Serenil, Clara Briseno, or Clara Briseno-Ogaz or Clara Briseno or Clara Ogaz.

A-6980380, Shanda, Elsie Zamora, or Elsie Zamora Salas (maiden name).

A-6853358, Simony, Marie Anne (nee Brady).

A-5916809, Sodeikat, Otto August Wilhelm or Sodiekat.

A-4575269, Staine, Antonio.

A-6397810, Szulc, Judel, or Judel Schultz.

A-2240218, Tavarez, Librada, or Librada Tavarez-Loya or Librada Loya.

A-1442007, Toong, David.

A-4947821, Tosini, Cesare Alessandro, or Chester Tosini.

A-1117158, Troutlein, William.

A-3458632, Uddin, Rahan.

A-1896007, Wang, Philip, or Philip Wong or Philip Sheng Ping Wang or Sheng Ping Wang.

A-3168180, Wlodarski, Waclaw Ignacy, or Waclaw Ignacy Wodarski or Wodarsky.

A-2227526, Zen, Osman Ben, or Osman Zen.

A-5944186, Ziemba, Eustachio, or Eustachius, or Stanislaus or Stanislaw or Stanley Ziemba.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, in order to get some information from the committee on this bill, Calendar No. 829, a concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens. We have a similar concurrent resolution, Calendar No. 841. How many suspensions are covered?

Mr. D'EWART. There are 97 cases covered by Senate Concurrent Resolution 65, each case recommended for approval. A check has been made to determine whether or not the alien could meet the requirements of the law, whether he was of good moral character and possessed of strong equities which would warrant suspension of deportation.

Mr. STEFAN. How many are covered by the other resolution?

Mr. D'EWART. The other resolution, Calendar No. 841, covers 165 cases.

Mr. STEFAN. That makes 250 cases of aliens in these two bills.

The reason I call this matter to the attention of the House is to ask the members of the committee whether or not this has been cleared through Mr. Watson Miller, Director of Immigration. Has the Commissioner approved those two resolutions?

While the gentleman is looking that up, I wish to call to the attention of the membership that when we brought up the bill making appropriations for the Bureau of Immigration, Mr. Miller called our attention to the fact that he has presently 3,500 aliens who have been convicted of some crime; a hundred of them were Communists, subversives, well supplied with money, who are out on parole and running over the country at will; and he has no legislation by which he can keep them under surveillance.

He indicates he wants such legislation because he is unable to secure landing certificates for them on account of the fact that about 100 or more of them come from countries behind the iron curtain. I wonder whether or not these approximately 250 aliens under discussion are among this category of aliens whose deportation this bill would suspend.

Mr. D'EWART. I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. In view of the fact there are so many of them and the committee cannot give us assurance that this has been approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and the Department, does not the gentleman think this ought to be laid over? I do not want to do anything that would create a hardship on any of these aliens but we should have information and know what we are doing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may ask unanimous consent to pass it over.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

The was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called Senate Concurrent Resolution 78.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

PRESBYTERIAN CONGREGATION OF GEORGETOWN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7966) to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Presbyterian congregation of Georgetown," approved March 28, 1806.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso in section 2 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the trustees of the Presbyterian congregation of Georgetown," approved March 28, 1806 (2 Stat. 356), is amended by striking out "3,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "25,000."

SEC. 2. Section 5 of such act is amended by striking out "held on the first Tuesday of April, in every year hereafter" and inserting in lieu thereof "held at such time as may be prescribed by the bylaws."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSEPHONE POULIOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1145) for the relief of Persephone Poulios.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, warrant of arrest, and bond, which may have been issued in the case of Persephone Poulios. From and after the date of enactment of this act the said Persephone Poulios shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and order have issued.

SEC. 2. In the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Persephone Poulios, who was temporarily admitted into the United States on December 17, 1945, shall be considered as having been lawfully admitted for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States.

SEC. 3. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Greece.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALICE WILLMARTH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2071) for the relief of Mrs. Alice Willmarth.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the provision of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, which excludes from the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Alice Willmarth, a native and citizen of Japan, and who is the wife of Benjamin Willmarth, a citizen of the United States. If otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, said Mrs. Alice Willmarth shall be granted the status of a nonquota immigrant.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. APOSTOLOS A. KARTSONIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2258) for the relief of Dr. Apostolos A. Kartsonis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, Dr. Apostolos A. Kartsonis, of Ann Arbor, Mich., who was admitted into the United States on a temporary visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Greece.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM ALFRED BEVAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2308) for the relief of William Alfred Bevan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, William Alfred Bevan, minor adopted son of Frederick W. Bevan, a citizen of the United States, and his wife, Margarita Llacer Bevan, shall be deemed to be the alien natural-born child of said Frederick W. Bevan and his wife, Margarita Llacer Bevan.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MASAE MARUMOTO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2427) for the relief of Masae Marumoto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Masae Marumoto, the Japanese fiancée of Capt. Harry Ost, of Fredonia, N. Dak., and that the said Masae Marumoto may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of three months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Masae Marumoto is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Capt. Harry Ost, and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Masae Marumoto, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event that the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Masae Marumoto, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Masae Marumoto as of the date of her entry into the United States upon the payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUMIKO KATO

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2431) for the relief of Sumiko Kato.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not hereafter apply to Sumiko Kato, the Japanese fiancée of Thomas D. Jacobs, Jr., a citizen of the United States and an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that Sumiko Kato may be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Sumiko Kato is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to said Thomas D. Jacobs, Jr., and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named parties does not occur within 3 months after the entry of said Sumiko Kato, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155 and 156). In the event the marriage between the above-named parties shall occur within 3 months after the entry of said Sumiko Kato, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence and said Sumiko Kato as of the date of her entry into the United States, upon the payment of the required fees and head taxes.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed,

and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GEORGETTE PONSARD

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2443) for the relief of Mrs. Georgette Ponsard.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration and naturalization laws which exclude from admission into the United States persons of the Japanese race, shall not be held to apply to Mrs. Georgette Ponsard, the wife of Paul Ponsard, who is residing in Mexico City, Mexico.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. D. STRENGER AND CLAIRE STRENGER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2479) for the relief of A. D. Strenger and his wife, Claire Strenger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the provisions of section 307 (b) of the Nationality Act of 1940 shall not be held to apply to A. D. Strenger and his wife, Claire Strenger.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARMEN E. LYON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2568) for the relief of Carmen E. Lyon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)), which excludes from admission to the United States persons who are ineligible to citizenship, shall not hereafter apply to Carmen E. Lyon, wife of Capt. Charles A. Lyon, an American citizen, and that the said Carmen E. Lyon may be permitted to enter the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIO ARTOLOZAGA EUSCOLA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6482) for the relief of Antonio Artolozaga Euscola.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel deportation proceedings against Antonio Artolozaga Euscola, of Salt Lake City, Utah, who entered the United States at the port of Philadelphia, Pa., on November 26, 1944, and that this alien shall be considered as having been admitted for permanent entry as of the date of his actual entry on the payment of the visa fee of $10 and the head tax of $8.

Upon enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Spanish quota for the first year that the said Spanish quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "entry" and insert "residence."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF LAND IN KENTUCKY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7255) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property in Hopkins County, Ky., to the estate of James D. Meadors.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the estate of James D. Meadors, late of Dawson Springs, Ky., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property in Hopkins County, Ky. Such real property was conveyed to the United States by the late James D. Meadors and his wife, the late Ella C. Meadors, for use by the United States for the construction and maintenance of a highway, but such real property is no longer being used for highway purposes. Such real property is more particularly described as follows:

A strip of land 100 feet in width, being 50 feet on each side of the centerline of the roadway which centerline begins at a point on the line between the lands of Cynthia C. Campbell and Matilda Dunning and of James D. Meadors, south 69 degrees east 940 feet from the corner of said lands of Cynthia C. Campbell and Matilda Dunning and of Mrs. Lou Coleman Cook, said point being on a 5-degree curve to the left and at station 25 plus 12.8 on said highway location, and running with said curve 231⅗ feet to the point of tangent at station 27 plus 44.4; thence with said tangent south 24 degrees east 1,086⅗ feet to a point on the bank of Tradewater River at station 38 plus 31.0.

Said strip of land is a part of the land conveyed to James D. Meadors by Lou C. Cook and husband by deed dated December 7, 1911, and recorded in deed book 87, page 601, in the office of the clerk of Hopkins County Court.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 21, insert the following:

"SEC. 2. The conveyance shall contain such additional terms, reservations, restrictions, and conditions as may be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be necessary to safeguard the interests of the United States."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOODYEAR AIRCRAFT CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 3122) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., Akron, Ohio, an easement for sewer purposes in, over, and across certain Government-owned lands situated in Maricopa County, Ariz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he hereby is, authorized to convey to the Goodyear Aircraft Corp., at such locations and under such terms and conditions as he may consider appropriate, a perpetual easement for sewage purposes in, over, and across a parcel of land constituting a portion of the naval air facility, Litchfield Park, Ariz., being located in Maricopa County, Ariz., acquired by the United States by deed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting by and through War Assets Administration, dated December 31, 1948, recorded in the land records of Maricopa County, Ariz., in docket No. 323 on pages 456 to 461, inclusive, which deed is on file in the Navy Department.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCY P. CROWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8287) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue duplicate of William Gerard's script certificate No. 2, subdivision 13, to Lucy P. Crowell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue to Lucy P. Crowell duplicate of William Gerard's special certificate numbered 2, subdivision numbered 13, originally issued for forty acres of public land pursuant to the act of Congress approved February 10, 1855, upon satisfactory proof of ownership and loss of same and the execution of a bond with good and sufficient securities, in double the market value of the certificate so to be issued, to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, conditioned to indemnify the United States against the presentation by an innocent holder of the alleged lost certificate. Such duplicate shall have all the legal force and effect of the original.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAY HOSKEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4370) for the relief of May Hosken.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of May Hosken who entered the United States on November 25, 1948, at Rouses Point, N. Y.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for India of the first year that such quota number is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEFFREY BRACKEN SPRUILL AND SUSAN SPRUILL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 8290) for the relief of Jeffrey Bracken Spruill and Susan Spruill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jeffrey Bracken Spruill and Susan Spruill shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor children of Captain and Mrs. W. R. Spruill, citizens of the United States, and shall be deemed to be nonquota immigrants within the purview of

sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEXANDER STEWART

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return for immediate consideration to Private Calendar No. 806, the bill (H. R. 1991) for the relief of Alexander Stewart, and I withdraw my objection to the present consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel forthwith any outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond in the case of the alien Alexander Stewart, Houston, Tex., and is directed not to issue hereafter any such warrants or orders in the case of such alien. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Alexander Stewart shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 11, after "residence" insert "as of July 3, 1947."

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for France of the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 572 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5074) to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MR. COX. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, as a reading of the resolution discloses, it makes in order the consideration of the bill H. R. 5074, which is a national defense measure. In view of world conditions, I cannot imagine that there would be any opposition whatever offered to the resolution or even to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the immediate adoption of the rule. Undoubtedly the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] will explain the provisions of the bill when we get into Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5074) to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 5074, with Mr. MURDOCK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 18 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was created by a Naval Appropriation Act on March 3, 1915. It is an independent agency of the Government which has grown in size and importance from the date of its creation until it now consists of a committee of 17 members, controls physical facilities of $140,000,000 and employs more than 7,000 persons. Its central office is located here in Washington, D. C., and its principal facilities are the Ames Laboratory in California, the Lewis Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio, and the Langley Laboratories at Langley Field, Va.

Since the date of its creation in 1915, the NACA has presented its financial requirements for successive fiscal years to the Appropriations Committee without prior authorization from any legislative committee of the Congress. On two occasions in the past, NACA appropriations bills have been subjected to point-of-order objections on the ground that they embodied legislation rather than appropriations. On one of those occasions, the objection was resolved in conference between the Senate and the House. On the other occasion, the House Parliamentarian ruled that the item in question was justified by existing statutory language.

During the hearings conducted by the House Appropriations Committee on the NACA budget for fiscal 1950, this question was again raised and the Appropriations Committee expressed the conviction that an appropriate legislative committee should entertain appropriate authorization legislation for the NACA. This resulted in H. R. 5074, the bill now under consideration, and I want to point out that this is the first general authorization bill for the NACA which has ever been presented to the Congress.

In addition to the general authorization this bill provides specific authorization for new construction, which items I shall presently detail.

Subsection (a) is a general authorization which permits NACA to equip and maintain and operate offices, laboratories, and research stations under its direction. The practical effect of this section is that it is a restatement of the original Appropriation Act of 1915, which created the NACA. This language merely carries out the desire to enact statutory provisions covering these authorizations. This will not be a recurring item in subsequent authorizing legislation for NACA.

Subsection (b) provides for new construction. In the NACA budget for fiscal 1951, an authorization of $16,500,000 is requested for new construction. Of this amount, $15,000,000 is in contract authority and the remaining $1,500,000 is cash. It is considered that this amount of cash is all that can be judiciously expended during fiscal 1951 to implement the authorizations under this section. The specific authorizations under this section are:

First. Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, facility for landing loads research. This is a new facility to simulate under identical conditions of speed, size, weight, and landing surface the loads encountered by aircraft landing gear from the moment of impact to the end of the landing run. Accurate measurements of these loads is essential to the design of safer, more dependable, and lighter landing gear. This will involve an estimated cost of $4,143,000, for which no cash has been requested, but contract authority in an equal amount and in lieu of cash has been requested of the Appropriations Committee.

Second. The second item at Langley involves an expansion of the utility systems which will be required for the utilization and protection of facilities to be completed during the fiscal year 1950. The project includes a new boiler for the heating plant, a water-storage plant, a frequency conversion unit. and the extension of power lines, at an estimated cost of $632,000 for which cash in the amount of $323,000 and contract authority in the amount of $309,000 will be requested.

Third. The next installation involves Wallops Island Station. The expanding research program at this station, which is an island off the coast of Virginia, requires more efficient transportation of personnel, supplies, equipment, research models, and construction apparatus to and from the island. The minimum facility which can meet these requirements is a small ferry and suitable docking facilities, at an estimated cost of $250,000; $50,000 cash and $200,000 contract authority will be requested.

Fourth. The next construction program is at Ames Aeronautical Laboratory in California. It is proposed to modernize the existing 16-foot high-

speed wind tunnel by increasing its maximum operating Mach number from 0.95 to 1.25. The alterations required are similar to those being completed on the Langley 16-foot tunnel. The need for and difficulty of conducting research at speeds near that of sound are so great that this type of improvement must be extended to this tunnel.

The estimated cost of this project will be $11,282,000, for which $502,000 in cash and $10,780,000 in contract authority will be requested.

Fifth. In addition, the present make-up air system of the 12-foot pressure wind tunnel is being utilized for operation of four other wind tunnel facilities, two of which have recently been completed. Experience has shown that delays because of conflicting needs are unduly hampering urgent research work. Additional compressor equipment is required to eliminate these delays and to provide stand-by equipment in the event of break-downs in the existing equipment.

The estimated cost of this project is $375,000, for which a full appropriation will be requested.

Sixth. The final project is located at the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio. Because of the great quantities of air required by jet engines, the altitude tunnel—originally designed for research on reciprocating engines, which do not require as great quantities of air as jet engines—is at present handicapped during research operations involving large jet engines at simulated and high altitudes by insufficient exhauster capacity. The additional exhauster capacity proposed for installation will eliminate this deficiency and greatly increase the usefulness of the altitude tunnel and two groups of high-speed air jets which operate from the same exhauster equipment.

The estimated cost of this project is $818,000, for which $250,000 cash and $568,000 contract authority will be requested.

As previously stated, these projects total $16,500,000, for which an appropriation of $1,500,000 will be requested for fiscal 1951.

Section 2 authorizes the Department of Defense or any other governmental agency, or the components thereof, to transfer supplies, equipment, aircraft, and aircraft parts to NACA without reimbursement. The section, as amended, merely authorizes the transfer of the enumerated types of matériel when it shall prove to the best interest of the Government, as determined between NACA and other governmental agencies.

Section 3 permits NACA to compensate aliens in their employ, notwithstanding statutory prohibition against such practice. There are at present only two such aliens, both of whom have given outstanding service and have been fully cleared by NACA. This same authority has been included in previous appropriation language and approved by the Congress.

Section 4 provides for the renaming of the laboratory at Cleveland, Ohio. More than 1 year ago the NACA renamed this facility the Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory. This section merely provides statutory approval of that action.

The committee added three new sections, 5, 6, and 7. Section 5 is general, authorizing legislation to implement section 1 (b), but not to exceed $16,500,000.

Section 6 authorizes appropriations to be made available until expended when specifically provided in the Appropriations Act. This will permit the NACA to develop a program on a sound basis and not to have it disrupted at a critical period.

Section 7 authorizes the prosecution of all projects under direct appropriation or contract authority, as the Appropriations Committee may direct.

The last three sections which the subcommittee has added are a restatement of identical provisions which are included in all construction bills which are presented to the committee.

The bill is endorsed by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics and the Bureau of the Budget and is reported to the House by the unanimous vote of the House Committee on Armed Services.

I would like to point out that the consideration of this bill at this time presents a rather unusual situation. The bill was reported to the House on February 22, 1950. It had been scheduled for House consideration on several different occasions, but, due to the press of other business, it has been impossible to consider the bill before today.

A complete justification for every item contained in this bill has previously been given to the House Committee on Appropriations, and an appropriation covering each of these items is included in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act for fiscal 1951, which legislation the House approved last Wednesday, May 10. So the net effect of this action today is to provide statutory authorization for the appropriations which you have already authorized and to remove future NACA appropriations, except for new construction, from point-of-order objections. There is no controversy involved here, and I trust that the proposed legislation will be expeditiously approved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. There may be no importance attached to it, but I wonder why the change in the name of the laboratory at Cleveland.

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman from Ohio probably can explain that. Mr. Lewis was one of the outstanding scientists of the world. He was one of the outstanding men and one of the men who really developed much of this program in the beginning.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. Was not Mr. Lewis Chairman of the Board at one time?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I think it is being named in his honor for the work he did.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes. He was one of the first Chairmen of the Board.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Most of this money is provided for research in that field, is it not?

Mr. DURHAM. Practically all of this is the real heart of the whole Air Corps development of this country. It includes the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand the money has already been appropriated, and this simply legalizes it?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. Does any part of this authorization inure to the benefit of the commercial air lines?

Mr. DURHAM. It does not.

Mr. ROONEY. In other words, it is strictly a military proposition?

Mr. DURHAM. It is strictly a military proposition. In fact, we get more from the civilian people than we give them, in my opinion.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it not correct that the lessons which are learned from the research activities of NACA are available for the benefit of commercial aviation as well as military aviation?

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly, it is; but I thought he asked if any direct appropriation went to civilian airlines under the authorization of this bill.

Mr. ROONEY. That was not my question at all. I understand that this money is appropriated to the NACA. My question concerned the suggestion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]: Are the commercial airlines going to benefit as the result of this $16,500,000 authorization?

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly; there is one provision in here, that of safety landing facilities in which they are very much interested—facilities we are building and expanding at Langley Field.

Mr. ROONEY. I think the commercial airlines are financially benefiting far too much from the hundreds of millions of dollars appropriated for aviation by the Congress. They receive far too many benefits they should pay for themselves.

Mr. DURHAM. Certainly, the gentleman will agree with me that it is the responsibility of us here in Congress to try to provide safety regulations for civilians as well as the military—by research basic and fundamental and applied.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wish to revert to the question asked by the gentleman from New York to which the gentleman from North Carolina replied that civilian airlines would benefit; the gentleman means they would benefit from the research. Is that correct?

Mr. DURHAM. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is it, or is it not, a fact that NACA does not undertake any specific research project at the request of civilian airlines?

Mr. DURHAM. Not that I know of.

Mr. JOHNSON. They just do general research and civilian airlines can

benefit from the facts derived, as well as the military?

Mr. DURHAM. If it had not been for the research done by the civilian airplane manufacturers before the war where would we have been when the war broke out? Where would we have been if we had not had the DC–3's, for instance? And other types of planes developed by private industry it is to our mutual advantage to exchange information.

Mr. ROONEY. I do not believe that we should appropriate money for any special research jobs for those who are in the business for profit.

Mr. DURHAM. We are not doing special jobs for them.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Is it not also true, in answer to the observation made by the gentleman from New York, that business and industry in this country make their contribution to the Government whenever there is an emergency? Why should not civilians benefit by this program as well as the Government?

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY. The reason I made the inquiries of the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina was to insure expenditure of the bulk of the requested authorization for military purposes rather than for the development of jet planes for the commercial airlines. If the gentleman assures me that this is 100 percent an authorization for the development of military planes for our Armed Forces, then I will resolve the question in favor of his bill and vote with the able gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. I may say to the gentleman that I believe I can assure him of that. Some of these projects at the present time in my opinion should not be discussed on the floor of the House, but if he wants to be assured on that I can assure him of it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a very important bill. At the outset, I wish to call the attention of the membership to the importance of the interrogation made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY], because he is chairman of the committee which makes appropriations for the Department of Commerce, wherein is located the Civil Aeronautics Authority and the Civil Aviation Board. We also at one time had the National Advisory Council for Aeronautics in our committee. I wish to assure the membership of the committee that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] knows his aviation, and he knows the appropriations that are made for all civilian aviation and all of the reesarch and is very familiar with the appropriations for NACA.

I call your attention to the fact that the bill we passed in this House just recently making appropriations for independent offices included the appropriations for this agency, the NACA. It included $40,890,000 for salaries and expenses; it included $15,500,000 for construction, and $10,000,000 for contract authorization. The agency wanted $46,000,000 for salaries and expenses, $16,500,000 for construction, and $15,000,000 for contract authorization. Here is a new authorization bill requesting an appropriation of $16,000,000 plus for construction.

I am proud of the work that has been done by the NACA. Its research has resulted in much advancement in aviation. We need that agency and need it very badly if we are going to keep pace with the rapid development and improvement in lighter-than-air craft. May I ask a question of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM], who has so ably explained this bill: How does it come that this authorization has been referred to the Armed Services Committee when usually such legislation is handled by the Independent Offices Subcommittee?

Mr. DURHAM. It was referred to that committee by the Speaker.

Mr. STEFAN. I am favorable to the Armed Services Committee handling defense research.

Mr. BROOKS. Legislation of this character has always come to that committee. I handled a bill of similar character some time back.

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad it was referred to the Committee on the Armed Services. I think it should be given full consideration by that committee which is so familiar with the rapid development in Navy and Army aircraft.

May I ask this further question: To which committee will the appropriation matter be referred? I take it it will be the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices?

Mr. DURHAM. I suppose it will be referred to the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. STEFAN. This $16,000,000 is in addition to the $40,890,000 and the $15,000,000?

Mr. DURHAM. Yes; this is in addition to that.

Mr. STEFAN. This is in part an emergency?

Mr. DURHAM. I believe the committee is convinced it is an emergency. I think the Appropriations Committee has already taken care of this. We have gotten into the development of speed beyond sound. I may say to the gentleman that up until last year we had never built a supersonic wind tunnel in this country, and I may say also that as early as 1936 Germany had built supersonic wind tunnels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I am wondering whether or not this duplicates any of the research being done by the CAA at its Indianapolis experimental station?

Mr. DURHAM. I am not familiar with that.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEFAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. I want to clear up what is apparently a misunderstanding in reference to the sixteen and one-half million dollars authorized by this bill. I understand the appropriation bill passed by the House last week for the fiscal year 1951 includes the sixteen and one-half million dollars authorized by this bill.

Mr. STEFAN. That is what I have been endeavoring to find out. This is not in addition?

Mr. COLE of New York. No.

Mr. STEFAN. In what item is it included in the appropriation bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. It is in the $15,000,000 for construction and one and one-half million dollars of contract authorization.

Mr. STEFAN. It is already in the bill passed by the House. This is simply an authorization for $16,000,000 which is already in the appropriation bill passed by the House?

Mr. COLE of New York. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. The details have been pretty well covered or answered by the previous speakers.

As a member of the subcommittee of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is chairman, which has charge of the appropriation for the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, we have been concerned for several years with the increasing budget and with the fact that a request for an increased authorization had not been before the legislative committee.

This year we suggested that the Committee on Armed Services review the matter, and were advised that it would not be possible for that committee to review the matter before the 1951 budget hearings in the subcommittee, as a result of which the money was put into the budget bill which passed last week. This is the authorization bill now to justify the appropriations the House has already approved. It is very definitely in order.

The work being done by the NACA is of a high quality. Such benefits as might be obtained by the private lines are only those which, under similar situations in other research, would be obtained by the development of new designs in automobiles or new planes or new ships or in the development of atomic energy, of which 20 percent could be used for war and 80 percent for war or peace.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DURHAM. May I say to the gentleman from California that we reported this bill back in February and the delay in its consideration is simply due to the fact that it has not been placed on the program.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is correct. We understood that. With the bill coming up and with the chairman's letter to us on the subject, the committee went ahead and appropriated the money.

I support this bill and hope it will pass.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I wonder if in the deliberations of the gentleman's committee you came to know something about whether there is a conflict between what the Air Force is doing in research and what these people are doing.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. There is no conflict.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. What actually occurred is that we got the cart before the horse. The Committee on Appropriations was really in advance of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. This money has already been appropriated, $1,500,000 cash and $15,000,000 for contract authorization. This bill is simply to give statutory authority to the NACA.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. With the approval of the committee on which the gentleman serves so ably, we felt that the money should be in this year's appropriation bill and put it there.

Mr. SHORT. The members of the Committee on Armed Services are very grateful to the gentleman and other members of his committee for being so considerate and generous.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to state for the information of the Committee that this bill was carefully considered by the full membership of the House Committee on Armed Services and received the complete approval of that committee. The explanation given by the gentleman from North Carolina covers the general subject matter of the bill, but I should like to emphasize that this bill will require no additional funds from the Treasury other than what has already been appropriated or is in the process of appropriation, and that it puts into statutory form the legislative authorization for the continuance of the operation of the NACA, which has not been the case in the past.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That within the limits of appropriations now or hereafter available to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics said Committee is hereby authorized—

(a) to equip, maintain, and operate offices, laboratories, and research stations under its direction;

(b) when specified in appropriation acts, to acquire additional land for, undertake additional construction at, and purchase and install additional equipment for, existing laboratories and research stations under its direction; and

(c) to purchase and maintain cafeteria equipment.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the National Military Establishment or any component thereof is authorized to transfer supplies, equipment, aircraft, and aircraft parts to the Committee without reimbursement: *Provided*, That such transfers shall be reported by the Committee to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget in accordance with regulations prescribed by him: *Provided further*, That this section shall not be construed as authorizing the transfer of administrative supplies or equipment: *And provided further*, That this section shall not be construed as prohibiting the loan of items of any sort to the Committee.

SEC. 3. Statutory provisions prohibiting the payment of compensation to aliens shall not apply to any persons whose employment by the Committee is determined to be necessary.

SEC. 4. Section 1, paragraph (b), subparagraph (3), of the act entitled "An act to promote the national defense by increasing the membership of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1948, is hereby amended by striking out the words "Flight Propulsion Research Laboratory" and by substituting in lieu thereof the words "Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4, strike out "within the limits of appropriations now or hereafter available to."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "when specified in appropriation acts."

Page 2, line 6, strike out "National Military Establishment" and insert "Department of Defense or any other governmental agency."

Page 2, line 20, strike out "by the committee" and after "determined", insert "by the committee."

Page 3, at the end of the bill, insert the following:

"SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums of money as may be necessary for the purposes of section 1 (b) of this act, but not to exceed $16,500,000.

"SEC. 6. Appropriations made to carry out the purposes of this act shall be available for expenses incident to construction, including administrative overhead, planning and surveys, and shall be available until expended when specifically provided in the appropriation act.

"SEC. 7. Any projects authorized herein may be prosecuted under direct appropriations or authority to enter into contracts in lieu of such appropriation."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MURDOCK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 5074) to promote the national defense by authorizing specifically certain functions of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 572, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAWSON GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he thought that the Kansas City gang learned anything from the Ohio gang.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to protest against the closing of the Lawson General Hospital in Atlanta, Ga. That hospital was originally an Army institution, but has been used most profitably and efficiently as a veterans' hospital. I concur in the President's order stopping the building of a new hospital in Atlanta because, in my opinion, no new hospitals should be built at this time; at least not until all available facilities have been used. I voted for the Rankin bill authorizing the building of new VA hospitals, but only after it had been amended so as to require the use of all present available facilities before the building of new ones.

The case for Lawson Hospital is so cogently stated by Mr. Calvin Cox in the Atlanta Constitution for May 15 that I am including that statement as a part of my remarks. I think the order taking over the Veterans' Administration hospital at Augusta is justified, there is no criticism of that, but by all means Lawson General Hospital in Atlanta should be kept open for the benefit of the veterans in north Georgia and northeast Alabama. To close Lawson would be a tragedy for these veterans.

Mr. Cox's article is as follows:

THE CASE FOR LAWSON HOSPITAL

(By Calvin Cox)

If service to the veteran is the yardstick, it would appear the closing of Lawson Veteran's Administration Hospital in Atlanta is, in the language of the GI, "strictly a bad deal." It is to be assumed that veteran hospitals are established to provide medical facilities for veterans, and, furthermore, it would seem logical to establish hospitals where great numbers of veterans are.

State records reveal there are 176,880 veterans in the area now served by Lawson. Under present plans, the 631-bed hospital would be closed by next January 1, and Oliver General Hospital, a former Army institution, established as Georgia's leading veterans' facility. In the Atlanta area, Hospital 48 would be converted from the tuberculosis facility it now is to a 225-bed general hospital.

There is in Augusta now a veterans' hospital of 1,342 beds. This is a psychiatric institution, though it does have approximately

200 beds for general patients. Activation of Oliver General Hospital as a VA facility would give the Augusta area 500 general hospital beds. Seventy miles from Augusta is another VA hospital at Columbia, S. C. It is a permanent facility, with 750 beds.

Counting the psychiatric facilities at Augusta, and with the addition of the 500-bed Oliver General, plus 750 beds in Columbia, we find approximately 2,500 beds available in an area containing only 26,656 Georgia veterans.

After the changes in hospitals are made, the 176,880-veteran area now served by Lawson would have only 225 beds available, at Hospital 48. If that old wartime word "logistics" means anything in peacetime, it would seem there's something radically amiss in this shift of facilities from an area of great need to an area of lesser need.

Under the rules governing operation of VA hospitals, the ailing veteran must go to the closest facility. To 176,880 Georgians, plus a large number in eastern Alabama, that means Lawson.

Lawson now is the leading veteran hospital in the Southeast. It is the leading veteran hospital in the Southeast because it is in the leading medical center of the Southeast, Atlanta. Lawson, because of its location, is able to attract more than enough doctors to fill its requirements. Lawson, because of the large number of patients and because of the consultation services of leading private specialists in Atlanta, and because of the connection with Emory, is certified as a training center by medical specialty boards.

Lawson Hospital is a chest-surgery center, a neurosurgery center, a tumor center, an orthopedic-surgery center, a plastic-surgery center, a specialized eye-ear-nose and throat center, a center for diagnostic study of unusual cases, and a research laboratory center. Because Lawson is the leading VA center for these practices in the Southeast, it is able to attract resident physicians who are training to become specialists in these fields. The hospital now has 55 such resident physicians, 55 consulting specialists, 15 full-time staff members, and 8 interns.

It is pointed out by Lawson officials that this resident-training program attracts large numbers of doctors to Atlanta and to Georgia, and that the vast majority of them stay in the State after becoming highly trained specialists. It is doubted if the reduced beds of 48 Hospital would qualify the facility for the training program now in operation at Lawson.

Lawson is a research center in the Southeast. The large number of cases there provides an admirable scope for research. At Lawson, one of the Nation's outstanding tuberculosis research authorities is on the trail of a simple blood test for tuberculosis. Other doctors are using the new drug cortisone in studies seeking to raise new barriers to the inroads of disease.

It is doubted these research facilities could be carried on in the reduced Hospital 48, with its 225 beds.

Yet it may be argued that these facilities of training and research could be transferred to the new Oliver General Hospital. But one must realize that Atlanta's reputation and standing as a medical center would not follow the VA to Augusta. That city has admirable facilities for doctor cooperation with a VA hospital in the presence of Georgia Medical College, but Augusta isn't the medical center Atlanta is.

The veterans are in the area covered by Lawson and the doctors are available in Lawson itself. What more logical combination is there than a large reservoir of need and the know-how to administer to it?

It would seem that putting the ax to Lawson, with its preeminent position in the field of VA medicine—a standing gained in 4 years of hard work and staff integration—is equivalent to knocking the hub out of a wheel and expecting it to roll on as though nothing had happened.

Long ago the VA said it would build new hospitals only in areas where outstanding medical personnel and facilities could be utilized in conjunction with the hospital. The Presidential order closing Lawson is an exact reversal of this logical policy. The proposed new 500-bed hospital for Atlanta, the structure planned to succeed Lawson, has been canceled, even though $250,000 had been spent for the site.

Look at Dublin. There is a wonderful hospital plant, but it is only partially operated because doctors do not wish to go there. That is why there are empty beds in VA hospitals, because the hospitals are in the wrong places. Some of the best surgery ever performed was done in tents during World War II. You have got to have the doctors, not marble palaces, and Atlanta has got them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGUIRE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR PRESENT-DAY FARM PROBLEM, ITS CAUSES AND ITS PROPOSED SOLUTION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, agriculture has become mechanized. During the years 1909–14, the base period for our original farm parity-price program, horses and mules powered practically all farm operations as well as most forms of city transportation. At that time about 80,000,000 acres were required to grow feed for the horses and mules being worked; therefore 80,000,000 acres were not available to produce food for human consumption.

But times have changed. Improved machinery, improved methods, improved seed, improved livestock breeds, and improved soil management have doubled the output of our farm acres. Today our farmers produce more food than our people can consume. They can no longer sell all the products they can produce, and so cannot continue to operate their acres at full capacity.

The American farmer today no longer needs the "horsepower" once used, but he certainly needs more than ever the "horse sense" he has always possessed. The very success of the American farmer today, the very abundance of our farm production, threatens now to destroy American agriculture.

For years our Department of Agriculture has relied upon price supports, acreage allotments, and marketing quotas to solve the farm problem of overproduction. These things have not worked too well. Recently the Department has given thought to better marketing facilities, world markets, and laboratory research work to find industrial uses for farm crops—and these recent efforts are all good and worth while. However, we have forgotten—passed up entirely—the old McNary-Haugen two-price program for the disposal of farm surpluses. Instead of shackling and regimenting our farmers, as the Brannan plan would do, why not try the as-yet-untried McNary-Haugen plan?

I endorsed the McNary-Haugen plan when it was first presented in Congress. I have always considered it the soundest farm plan advanced by anyone, and I still advocate it as a permanent solution to our farm surplus problem.

Briefly the McNary-Haugen plan proposed a two-price system for farm products, a fair and equitable price on the American market, and a world price for all surpluses exported. The losses suffered by exporting surpluses at world prices would be made up by a percentage assessment upon the farmer for each pound or bushel he sold at the American market price. Wheat, corn, cotton, and oats were the crops to be covered. This plan would not cost the American taxpayer 1 cent. There was and still is more horse sense wrapped up in the old McNary-Haugen plan than in any of the New Deal farm plans. It should be given a trial.

PRICE-SUPPORTS POLICY BOOMERANGS

Mr. Speaker, Henry Wallace when Secretary of Agriculture started a policy of price supports for agricultural commodities that has proven a boomerang. Surpluses of all kinds of perishable farm commodities are piling up under the Wallace price-support program, proving the program extremely costly, very embarrassing, and absolutely unworkable.

For example, under the egg-support program the country's egg production for January 1950 over January 1949 increased 12 percent, which means one-half billion more eggs produced in January 1950 over January 1949. At this rate the Government will have to buy up eight to ten billion surplus eggs this year as compared to the 2,500,000,000 egg surplus bought up by the Government last year.

The potato story is a similar one. The Government paid out $225,000,000 to buy up and destroy the 130,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes for 1948. Acreage limitations were imposed on growers for the 1949 crop. The growers then planted their potato rows closer together, fertilized heavily, and produced 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes in 1949 for the Government to buy up and destroy. In the meantime, the market price for potatoes was so high that potato consumption per person fell from 123 pounds to 108 pounds, a drop of 12 percent.

The egg and potato surpluses are insignificant, however, compared to the Government-owned surpluses of wheat, corn, cotton, flaxseed, linseed oil, and so forth. Storage facilities for these surpluses were expanded last year and will have to be expanded again this year. The Commodity Credit Corporation is asking Congress for an additional $2,000,000,000 to finance these purchases. Nothing can save the Wallace price-support program but disastrous crop failures. Therefore alterations in our agricultural aid program should be made, and made soon.

The National Grange suggests the two-price system for agricultural products as a permanent solution—a fair price on the American market, and a world price for surpluses shipped abroad. In reality this is the old McNary-Haugen farm plan.

THE ORIGIN OF THE BRANNAN PLAN

Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress have learned from an authoritative source that the much-publicized Brannan farm plan is the brain child of Henry Wallace, Rexford Tugwell, and Alger Hiss. Prepared when Wallace was Secretary of Agriculture—when both Tugwell and Hiss worked for Wallace—it was buried for several years in the musty

archives of the Department of Agriculture and then resurrected by Mr. Brannan when he became Secretary. He dusted it off and is now trying to sell it to the American farmers. If the plan is the brain child of the Wallace-Tugwell-Hiss trio, as reported, then our American farmers should beware.

Mr. Brannan has had months to work out the details of the Wallace-Tugwell-Hiss plan, but according to observers at Des Moines, he was unable or unwilling to reveal a single definite item of cost. He had no answer to charges that milk subsidies alone would cost the taxpayers nearly $2,500,000,000 a year. He refused to hazard a guess on the cost of guaranteeing an "income standard" on corn and wheat surpluses. He asks the farmers to buy a pig in a poke that he labels "prosperity" without any mention of cost to the taxpayer, or of the socialistic regimentation involved in the plan.

Our farmers do not want their prosperity dependent on the whims of political planners in Washington. Farmers still resent the killing of little pigs, ordered by the Wallace-Tugwell-Hiss trio 15 years ago, and they resent the Government controls Mr. Brannan now proposes. When we start writing programs of this sort in Washington and begin poking them down the people's throats, we can no longer call our Government a Republic.

SECRETARY BRANNAN'S DOUBLE-BARRELED FARM PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, Henry Wallace is out of both Government and party, but his program goes marching on. Wallace paid farmers for pigs and crops they did not raise while millions of people in the cities were short of food. Now Secretary Brannan proposes a guaranteed income for the farmer and lower prices for the consumer. Brannan's plan is a political plan, not an economic plan. He wants to please two great groups of voters—the farmers and the city workers—at the expense of the general taxpayer.

What will his new plan cost? We know that food subsidies in Great Britain cost $1,500,000,000 per year. Our population is three times as large as Great Britain's and we have a much higher standard of living. Therefore, it is reasonable to suppose that food subsidies for the consumer here would cost at least $6,500,000,000 per year, without considering Government payments to the farmer to insure his guaranteed income. Since the four major crops—corn, wheat, cotton, and tobacco—are not to come under the new program, but continue under parity supports at a cost of over $1,000,000,000 a year, the total cost of Secretary Brannan's political farm program could easily run between seven and eight billion dollars per year.

Mr. Speaker, in trying to analyze the Brannan program one finds it difficult to decide whether it is a farm program or a consumer program. Secretary Brannan proposes that farm prices should be allowed to sink to whatever level the law of supply and demand will bring about. This will please the 145,000,000 consumers by providing cheap food, but it will saddle upon the same 145,000,000 consumers added taxes—seven to eight billion dollars—to make up the difference between the cheap food prices and prices that guarantee a fair return to the farmer—plus a heavy payroll burden for the thousands of extra Government employees that will be needed to implement the program.

The 6,000,000 farmers of the Nation, on the other hand, are expected to be delighted with definite assurance that they will receive a check from Uncle Sam to guarantee them a fair return for their labor. Not so pleasing, however, to these same 6,000,000 farmers will be the endless bureaucratic dictation, controls, edicts, and restrictions that will be insisted upon as a necessary part of the Brannan plan. In advancing this program to subsidize and socialize American agriculture, Secretary Brannan did not consult any of the leaders of our farm organizations.

I ask: "Shall we adopt an untried socialistic program which even if it did work would destroy the traditional independence of our farm people? Will the American farmer benefit by regimentation and Government control, which is what the program involves?"

THY LEFT HAND VERSUS THY RIGHT HAND

Mr. Speaker, the Good Book says, "Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth." The Department of Agriculture takes this biblical statement literally because it does not let the State Department know what it is doing, or vice versa. For example:

Last year the Department of Agriculture bought up 93,355,837 pounds of butter to take it off the market to keep up the high price. But, at the same time, the State Department made a Reciprocal Trade Agreement with Denmark, cutting the duty on butter in half and permitting the importation of 60,000,000 pounds of butter each year. Here we have the right hand—State Department—increasing the supply of butter on the American market, while the left hand—Department of Agriculture—was doing its best to decrease the supply of butter by taking 93,355,937 pounds off the market.

It would be much easier for both the American taxpayer and the American housewife if these two hands of the Government got together and worked together.

OUR ABSURD POTATO PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress are receiving letters protesting against the administration's program which destroys potatoes and permits imports of Canadian potatoes. The potato program is nothing in the world but socialism in action. It is the result of Government interference with the free market and the attempts of a few men to substitute their own plans for the workings of a free market.

Everybody loses by such a course. Henry Wallace started these various plans to cut down acreage, kill little pigs, and plow under corn and cotton. It was economically absurd then and it is absurd now. As time goes on the whole thing becomes more and more absurd—and more expensive.

The taxpayer loses because he is taxed heavily to pay support prices whether he is a city man or a farmer. He also loses because he has to pay higher prices for the products he consumes. By running the price of food up, the Government is unjust both to the farmer and to the consumer. Because laborers have to pay more for their food, they strike for higher wages. These higher wages are reflected in the costs of manufactured articles which the farmer must buy. Hence everyone loses—and will continue to lose so long as a Government subsidy-conditioned electorate continues to elect Fair Deal candidates.

In the meantime Secretary Brannan is making speeches all over the country in favor of a plan that would completely socialize agriculture. The tragic thing about it is that the Brannan plan is not a farm plan at all. It is a political plan, advocated by a small group of planners who are in present favor in Washington and who desire to make over and take over America.

Mr. Speaker, I have tried to present a fair picture of our present-day farm problem. I have tried to point out some of the causes and also to make suggestions for a cure. However, I am satisfied that until we get rid of the starry-eyed theorists that occupy policy-making positions in the Department of Agriculture today; until we get rid of the believers in socialism and communism that occupy important positions in our Federal Government, we will continue to travel down the road to a controlled agriculture, with Washington bureaucrats telling our American farmers when to sow and when to reap, what to plant and how much to plant, when to sell and for what price to sell. When we have controlled agriculture, this will not be America as our forefathers knew it or planned it.

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield.

Mr. TOWE. I noticed an article by Arthur Krock in the New York Times telling about the Chinese in A. D. 1100 trying a plan similar to what is now known as the Brannan plan. Of course, that started them down the road to agricultural despair and failure.

Mr. MASON. If the gentleman will read my complete speech, he will know that I am supporting and advocating the two-price system for our farm products, known originally as the McNary-Haugen plan.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House meets on Thursday next it meet at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGUIRE). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LABOR IS AWAKENING

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the position taken by the President last week in some of his speeches was in direct opposition to that of a part of organized labor in this country.

Apparently the President had not read the newspapers lately. They show that the workers in the electrical utility industry refuse to submit to the inroads of bureaucracy and socialism at the cost of their personal liberty. Both the CIO and the A. F. of L. have served notice in the respective unions operating in the electrical utility industry that the nationalization of that industry has gone too far.

The President stated last week that free enterprise must be destroyed in the electrical power industry in its relation to water resources.

He meant, of course, that the electrical workers, the men who read the meters, climb the poles, and run the generators would then be robbed of their right to strike, their right to work under conditions dictated by themselves, their right to bargain collectively, their right to negotiate freely.

He declared by inference that in future the workers of this class will become the mere puppets of Government ownership.

Already the bureaucrats and Socialists are beating the drums for nationalization of steel and the socialization of medicine. Coal, railroads, and ships are marked for the same fate. The difference between Socialist Britain and Socialist America is only a matter of degree.

This week, for the 'steenth time, the Grand Coulee Dam was rededicated. Harry Truman took his turn at it this time. It is probably the most dedicated dam in the world. Every time a suitable occasion arises to make a doctrinaire speech for the socialistic system of government, somebody rises up and dedicates that dam all over again.

Union labor, particularly the Utility Workers of America, CIO, and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, A. F. of L., will be especially interested in the President's declaration of war on private enterprise in connection with the electrical power industry. Nationalized power is, of course, step No. 1 on the road to socialism—from which there is no road back to freedom.

Union labor has come to realize that, as workers for the Government, their right to negotiate will be destroyed. Destroyed, too, will be the sacred right of all workingmen, the right to quit their jobs in protest against conditions which they refuse to tolerate.

A Government worker in industrial production—this does not apply to the career services in the normal functions of Government—necessarily becomes a mere cog in the wheel of Government. Union labor knows and fears this, and it knows President Truman should know of their fears.

I speak with some emotion and feeling when I say to rob a man of the incentive of working out his own salvation, of his freedom to negotiate in an atmosphere of liberty, puts him in a strait-jacket, destroying American principles.

My career in this House has been largely devoted to sound development of our Nation's water resources. I find that union labor and my own thinking on this subject are in complete harmony. I should like to summarize my beliefs and my stand in opposition to Truman Marxism. I quote a recent statement which is the voice of union labor and entirely reflects my own beliefs:

1. Where power is generated in conjunction with worth-while water projects, the transmission, distribution, and sale of such energy should, under proper regulation, be allocated to the private utility companies.

Where investor-owned companies fail to provide for the distribution and sale of electrical energy then, and then only, should the Government undertake such duties.

2. Approximately one-fifth of the power generated in America today is distributed and sold by Government agencies. We believe that further encroachment of Government into the utility industry should be discouraged except in cases of national emergency.

3. It is our firm belief that the best interests of all of the people of this Nation can best be served and secured through collective bargaining in investor-owned public-utility corporations.

4. We shall continue to advocate that the water resources of the Nation be developed. However, we shall object to any move that will result in these worthy projects being used as a means of destroying taxpaying utility companies who, under proper regulation, are furnishing adequate service.

5. We further recommend as a matter of policy that the national officers, the local officers, and members use every means available to prevent further nationalization of the utility industry; and

We further recommend as a matter of policy that we insist on fair and proper regulation of the utility industry and that every effort be made to compel utility managements to fulfill their obligations to the consumers and to their employees.

I wish it were my own high privilege to lay claim to the authorship of the language I have just quoted. Certainly I am wholly in accord with the entire statement. It happens, however, to be the statement of policy unanimously adopted on April 30 of this year by the annual convention of the Utility Workers of America (CIO). It is union labor's complete answer to Harry Truman's Marxist death sentence to free enterprise in the electric power industry.

I am happy to state that certain local unions in this industry who are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor have indicated an equally aggressive attitude toward the defense of private enterprise. Union labor has become more and more aware of its stake in the fight against creeping socialism.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. TACKETT. I want in my humble way to state that I am sincerely in accord with every word that the gentleman has uttered; I think that he does visualize the possibility that if something is not done to curtail the moves that are now under way and tendencies that are being followed by the Government not only to socialize the electrical industry but every major enterprise of this country that we will soon find ourselves in the predicament of Great Britain. Incidentally, the first article in the Appendix of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] on the theory that electric power is a public responsibility because it is a necessity. I cannot follow that doctrine. I believe that food is a necessity, that clothing is a necessity, that wearing apparel, and the conveniences of life that are essential to this day and time, are all as much necessities as electricity. If we are going to act on the pattern of determining the public responsibility according to the necessities of life, then we, of course, would socialize the entire economy of this country.

As late as the 8th day of this month, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down an opinion wherein they declared that even the war production plants were operated in private enterprise; that to hold otherwise would be contrary to the very philosophy of government which made this the greatest country on the face of the globe. Even the Supreme Court of the United States, which some allege has been packed, can still see the need for continuing private enterprise if we are to exist as the great democracy we have become.

Mr. DONDERO. I thank the gentleman for his contribution and I may say to the gentleman from Arkansas that private investment and private enterprise are the things that have made this country what it is, not public ownership.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman made the statement in the course of his remarks that the only difference between socialism in the United States and socialism in Britain was simply a matter of degree. The gentleman also made some reference to Marxism. I wonder if he would feel that the difference between Trumanism and Marxism is also just a matter of degree?

Mr. DONDERO. The similarity is in government ownership and in government control of everything.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. JACOBS. I wish to point out in connection with the statements that have just been made and the contention that Trumanism and Marxism are the same except in degree——

Mr. DONDERO. No; I said that socialism in Great Britain and socialism in America was only a matter of degree.

Mr. JACOBS. I think that it was predicated upon public ownership. I would like to know what the gentleman thinks about this—and this is the record—at the close of the war this Government owned some $27,000,000,000 worth of war plants that we had built up as a part of the war effort and which constituted approximately 25 percent of the plant potential in this country. We immediately set about—and that was this administration that my friends on the other side are charging with socialism—we immediately set about selling and transferring those plants to private enterprise.

Mr. DONDERO. I think the gentleman from Indiana has missed the point entirely. We were not discussing war plants; we were simply discussing the attitude taken by organized labor in the utility field. I speak of the electric-utility field—their attitude in deference of private enterprise instead of Government ownership and control.

Mr. JACOBS. I am only addressing my remarks to the last statement made in regard to the public ownership of property. It is well for the RECORD to show that the present administration disposed of these plants as rapidly as they could be sold to private enterprise, which is the antithesis of any attempt to go toward socialism.

Mr. DONDERO. As far as the war was concerned, whatever the Government had to build during the war was of no further use to it when the war was over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WERDEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for two additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WERDEL. I would like to take a minute to point out that there is still a relevancy to the statement made by the gentleman now in the well of the House and that is that in England they only desire at the present time complete ownership of six or eight of the basic industries. In England they socialize the industries by controlling the operation of those that are left in private ownership. So that the very fact that this Government, after having built plants during the war, decides to put them into private ownership, but still desires to control their operation, their profits, their prices, and all of their labor costs and functions, is still along the same line, different only in the matter of degree, of that going on in England.

Mr. DONDERO. In my opinion, the Socialist Government in England could not continue if it did not receive support from the United States, which they have been receiving since the end of the war.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. In reference to the statement about the Truman Marxism philosophy, the gentleman now addressing the House is located pretty close to the city of Detroit?

Mr. DONDERO. Very close to it.

Mr. PRICE. Who operates the transportation system in the city of Detroit?

Mr. DONDERO. The city of Detroit does and the transportation system is operating in the red like the Federal Government.

Mr. PRICE. Who was the main proponent of that idea many, many years ago? Was it not Senator Couzens, the great Republican Senator from the State of Michigan, and was he not a great factor in taking over the transportation system?

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman wish me to commit myself to a policy of public ownership in a local matter?

Mr. PRICE. I think when you get into this question, you can go pretty deeply into it and you will find just as many on the left-hand side of the aisle as on the right-hand side of the aisle of the same opinion.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not believe in Government control and ownership when private enterprise can do the job just as well.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1950, the House Committee on Education and Labor, by a vote of 13 to 12, agreed to consider the Burke public-school teachers' salary bill, H. R. 5939, on or after April 17.

I am convinced that the committee acted in good faith, that it meant what it said, and that it will move to action in the near future.

A considerable part of the committee has been busy, it should be noted, as members of the Lucas subcommittee charged to study and report on Federal aid to assist the States in the development of our public school facilities. Another group has been hard at work for several weeks as members of the Bailey subcommittee which has been studying Federal responsibility in relation to school districts overcrowded by reason of Federal activities.

The Federal Government carries a definite responsibility in both these areas. That responsibility should be discharged. The House should move to favorable action as soon as the legislation being prepared by these subcommittees can be favorably reported by the full Committee on Education and Labor.

The Bailey subcommittee has now completed its work. The first, H. R. 7940, is ready to report by the full committee to the House. This bill authorizes Federal aid to assist some 600 war-impacted school districts in meeting the current costs of operating their public elementary and public secondary schools. The second bill, H. R. 8113, providing Federal aid to assist these districts in erecting school facilities made necessary by increased numbers of school children resulting from Federal activities, is before the full committee.

Let me make myself clear in this connection that what I am saying is not in any slightest degree intended to minimize the importance of legislation directed at the alleviation of critical educational needs in these 600 school districts. In their present form, or in any reasonably amended form in which H. R. 7940 and H. R. 8113 may later appear on the floor of the House of Representatives, I intend to actively support them. I congratulate my distinguished colleague, the Honorable CLEVELAND M. BAILEY, of West Virginia, for the splendid job he has done on these bills.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Critical School Areas," which appeared in the Washington Post, May 3, 1950.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, the editorial is as follows:

CRITICAL SCHOOL AREAS

Of all the pending proposals for Federal aid to bolster up the Nation's sagging public-school system, perhaps the most urgent is that aimed at the relief of districts where Federal expansion has created a critical shortage of school facilities. There are more than 500 school districts affected in this way, and they have about a million and a half school children whose education is being impaired as a result. The problem grew out of the acquisition of large property holdings by the Federal Government and an influx of Federal workers. This meant simultaneously an increase in the school-age population and a decrease in the taxable sources of revenue.

The case for Federal aid in these acutely congested areas was stated succinctly by Agnes E. Meyer at a meeting here recently attended by delegates from 19 States. "We are trying to convince Congress," she said, "that the Federal Government must help to solve certain problems created by activities of the Federal Government." In a real sense, the families who migrated to these areas at the Government's behest are our own displaced persons. They constitute a national problem neglect of which will result in national injury. The problem cannot be solved at the local level. It needs to be solved promptly by the Nation in the national interest no less than in the interest of the individuals and the localities involved.

The Post editorial writer states that "perhaps" the most urgent proposal for Federal aid to education now pending in the Congress is represented by the Bailey bills. There is some doubt in the mind of the editorial writer on that point. But certainly all of us will agree that the needs in the war-impacted school districts are critical and should be met.

The Bailey bills are excellent as far as they go. The great difficulty is that they do not go far enough. They limit Federal aid to several hundred school districts or approximately one-half of 1 percent of the school districts in the Nation, when the benefits of Federal aid should be extended to many thousands of school districts. They provide help in districts enrolling from one to one and one-half million children where help is needed for some 10,000,000 children who are either attending no school at all today or else are enrolled in substandard schools.

There can be no excuse, Mr. Speaker, for the Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am a member, to continue long to bypass the comprehensive assignment of shoring up our public-school systems, which are in desperate straits today, in order to concentrate exclusively upon mere fractions of that assignment.

FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY IS INCLUSIVE

It is easily demonstrated, in my judgment, that the Federal Government has a responsibility to aid the States in financing public education in the war-impacted school districts.

It is also demonstrable that the Federal Government has a responsibility to aid the States in providing educational opportunities for children wherever they are neglected.

The worth of a child as an asset to our country cannot be evaluated according

to whether he is denied adequate schooling because of Federal activities, or because the State and community lack the financial strength to provide good schools, or because he lives in a community where overcrowding has resulted from vast population migrations resulting from the war effort.

A neglected child is no less neglected, and no less costly to our country because of that neglect, no matter what the factors responsible for that neglect may be.

At a time when the ways of free men are challenged for existence by ideologies that seek in every way to destroy democracy the demands for national security require that each citizen must function at the peak of his power.

He must know the history of our country and of its political and economic institutions. He must be productive. He must be cooperative. He must possess a controlling conviction in the ways of free men. He must be willing to serve our country in whatever role may be available for him in a time of national crisis. The man cannot qualify in these respects unless in his youth his mind and heart were disciplined through proper education to these ends. This training for youth in time of peace is as basic as in the discipline of military life in time of war.

The demands of national security are urgent. It is appropriate to build our defenses across mid-Europe and to bolster our strength in the far reaches of the Pacific. The billions of dollars being spent for this purpose abroad are of great importance. Our policies directed at security and peace are not, however, in balance when with so many billions expended to bulwark our defenses abroad we neglect to strengthen them through the expenditure of a relatively small sum of money to guaranty to our own children a fair chance to get a basic education in the American way of life here at home.

These are some of the reflections which prompt me to hope that the House Committee on Education and Labor will at an early date give effect to its March 15 decision to consider the Burke public-school teachers' salary bill, H. R. 5939. I have personally favored the committee bill all the way through, but I believe the Burke salary bill for public-school teachers will serve the purpose. This is sound legislation, directed at the accomplishment of an important objective.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include therewith a memorializing resolution passed by the General Court of Massachusetts.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Evening News entitled "High Time To Stop Wishful Thinking and To View the Facts Realistically," an editorial in which tribute is properly paid to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEARNEY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ALBERT (at the request of Mr. STIGLER), from May 16 to May 20, 1950, on account of official business.

To Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 10 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 1151. An act to amend the act establishing grades of certain retired noncommissioned officers;

H. R. 1354. An act to provide for a per capita payment from funds in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Indians of California;

H. R. 2387. An act authorizing the Governor of Alaska to fix certain fees and charges with respect to elections;

H. R. 2783. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land, with improvements, to the city of Alpena, Mich.;

H. R. 3494. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to transfer a building in Juneau, Alaska, to the Alaska Native Brotherhood and/or Sisterhood, Juneau (Alaska) Camp;

H. R. 5097. An act for the administration of Indian livestock loans, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 466. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First United States International Trade Fair, Inc., Chicago, Ill., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2350. An act to amend the act of August 8, 1946, relating to the payment of annual leave to certain officers and employees; and

S. 3396. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey to the State of Kentucky title to certain lands situated in Hardin and Jefferson Counties, Ky.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 17, 1950, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1450. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the second quarterly report on the administration of the advance planning program authorized under Public Law 352, Eighty-first Congress, approved October 13, 1949; to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1451. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of Panama Railroad Company for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1949 (H. Doc. No. 594); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 8527. A bill to amend section 2883 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by Public Law 448, Eighty-first Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KARSTEN:

H. R. 8528. A bill to provide for the purchase of bonds to cover officers and employees of the Government; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 8529. A bill to provide retroactive promotions for certain postal transportation clerks engaged in military service or service on war transfer during World War II; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORTON:

H. R. 8530. A bill to amend the act approved August 4, 1919, as amended, providing additional aid for the American Printing House for the Blind; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 8531. A bill to amend the programs on the watersheds authorized in section 13 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SADLAK:

H. Con. Res. 207. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should rescind foreign-trade agreements with Communist-controlled countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. Res. 604. Resolution requesting the President to appoint a bipartisan commission relating to American policy in Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 8532. A bill for the relief of Joseph A. Myers, Hazel C. Myers, and Helen Myers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 8533. A bill for the relief of Emiko Nishimura; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2135. By Mr. HESELTON: Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress to work for the unification of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2136. By Mr. POLK: Petition of the Central Labor Council of Portsmouth, Ohio, signed by E. H. Dinsmore, secretary, petitioning Congress to prevent the carrying out of the Postmaster General's order of April 18, 1950; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2137. By Mr. RICH: Resolution of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Jersey Shore, Pa., going on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2138. Also, resolution of Loyal Order of Moose, No. 81, Renovo, Pa., urging that the order of the Postmaster General curtailing postal service be rescinded; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.